

The Department of State

bulletin

LEADERSHIP OF WORLD PEACE *Review by the
Secretary* 663

Vol. XXIII, No. 591

October 30, 1950

UNITED NATIONS PROPOSE MEANS TO UNITE AND
KEEP THE PEACE *Review by John Foster Dulles* 667

INCOMING OUTLOOK IN INDIA AND PAKISTAN *Review by
Secretary Dulles* 669





The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXIII, NO. 591 • PUBLICATION 3996

October 30, 1950

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$6, foreign \$8.50
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has
been approved by the Director of the
Bureau of the Budget (July 29, 1949).

Note: Contents of this publication are not
copyrighted and items contained herein may
be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT
OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be
appreciated.

Partnership of World Peace

Address by the President¹

I have just returned from Wake Island, where I had a very satisfactory conference with General Douglas MacArthur.²

I understand that there has been speculation about why I made this trip. There is really no mystery about it. I went because I wanted to talk to General MacArthur.

There is no substitute for personal conversation with the commander in the field who knows the problems there from first-hand experience. He has information at his fingertips which can be of help to all of us in deciding upon the right policies in these critical times.

I went out to Wake Island to see General MacArthur because I did not want to take him far away from Korea, where he is conducting very important operations with great success. Events are moving swiftly over there now, and I did not feel he should be away from his post too long.

I have come back from this conference with increased confidence in our long-range ability to maintain world peace.

At Wake Island, we talked over the Far Eastern situation and its relationship to the problem of world peace. I asked General MacArthur for his ideas on the ways in which the United States can most effectively assist the United Nations in promoting and maintaining peace and security throughout the Pacific area.

We discussed Japan and the need for an early Japanese peace treaty. Both of us look forward with confidence to a new Japan which will be peaceful and prosperous.

United Nations Action in Korea

General MacArthur told me about the fighting in Korea. He described the magnificent achievements of all the United Nations forces serving under his command. Along with the soldiers of

the Republic of Korea, these forces have now turned back the tide of aggression. More fighting men are coming from free nations all over the world. I am confident that these forces will soon restore peace to the whole of Korea.

We Americans naturally take special pride in the superb achievements of our own soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen. They have written a glorious new page in military history. We can all be proud of them.

It is also a source of pride to us that our country was asked to furnish the first commander of United Nations' troops. It is fortunate for the world that we had the right man for this purpose—a man who is a very great soldier—General Douglas MacArthur.

The United Nations action in Korea is of supreme importance for all the peoples of the world.

For the first time in history, the nations who want peace have taken up arms under the banner of an international organization to put down aggression. Under that banner, the banner of the United Nations, they are succeeding. This is a tremendous step forward in the age-old struggle to establish the rule of law in the world.

The people of San Francisco have shown that they appreciate the importance of the United Nations as a vital force in world affairs. I am told that in this area alone 71 organizations are celebrating United Nations Week.

The United Nations was established here in this very building 5 years ago. It was founded in the hope and in the belief that mankind could have just and lasting peace.

Today, as a result of the Korean struggle, the United Nations is stronger than it has ever been. We know now that the United Nations can create a system of international order with the authority to maintain peace.

When I met with General MacArthur, we discussed plans for completing the task of bringing peace to Korea. We talked about the plans for establishing a "unified, independent, and demo-

¹ Delivered at San Francisco, Calif. on Oct. 17 and released to the press by the White House on the same date.

² For statement by the President at Wake Island, see BULLETIN of Oct. 28, 1950, p. 643.

eratic" government in that country in accordance with the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

It has been our policy, ever since World War II, to achieve these results for Korea.

Our sole purpose in Korea is to establish peace and independence. Our troops will stay there only so long as they are needed by the United Nations for that purpose. We seek no territory or special privilege. Let this be crystal clear to all—we have no aggressive designs in Korea or in any other place in the Far East or elsewhere.

No country in the world which really wants peace has any reason to fear the United States.

The only victory we seek is the victory of peace.

The United Nations forces in Korea are making spectacular progress. But the fighting there is not yet over. The North Korean Communists still refuse to acknowledge the authority of the United Nations. They continue to put up stubborn, but futile, resistance.

The United Nations forces are growing in strength and are now far superior to the forces which still oppose them. The power of the Korean Communists to resist effectively will soon be at an end.

Rehabilitation for Korea

However, the job of the United Nations in Korea will not end when the fighting stops. There is a big task of rehabilitation to be done. As a result of the Communist aggression, Korea has suffered terrible destruction. Thousands upon thousands of people are homeless, and there is serious danger of famine and disease in the coming winter months.

The United Nations is already extending relief to ease the suffering which the Communist invasion has brought about and it is preparing to help the Koreans rebuild their homes and restore their factories.

General MacArthur and Ambassador Muccio gave me a vivid picture of the way in which the process of reconstruction has already begun. Railroads are being restored, bridges are being rebuilt, and public utilities are beginning to function.

We will use the resources of our army and our Economic Cooperation Administration to meet the immediate emergency. We will give our strong support to the United Nations program of relief and reconstruction that will soon be started. The United States will do its full part to help build a free, united, and self-supporting Korean Republic.

In a very real sense, the unity of the free nations in meeting the aggression in Korea is the result of a firmly held purpose to support peace and freedom—a purpose which the free nations have pursued together over the years.

The name "United Nations" was first used in the dark days of the Second World War by the

countries then allied to put down another aggression.

From that day until this, the cause of peace has been strengthened by an active policy of cooperation among the free nations. It is not by chance, but as a result of that steady policy, that 53 members of the United Nations rallied immediately to meet the unprovoked aggression against the Republic of Korea.

It has been as a part of that same policy and common purpose that we have joined during the past 5 years in building up the strength of the peace-loving forces of the world. We have contributed to this end through the Marshall Plan in Europe and through economic assistance in many other parts of the world. We have also contributed to this end through military aid to countries threatened by aggression. All around the world, the free nations have been gaining strength.

We have to recognize that, as we have moved steadily along in the postwar years, our policy of building a peaceful world has met constant opposition from the Soviet Union.

Soviet Obstructionism

Here, in San Francisco 5 years ago, we hoped that the Soviet Union would cooperate in this effort to build a lasting peace.

But Communist imperialism would not have it so. Instead of working with other governments in mutual respect and cooperation, the Soviet Union attempted to extend its control over other peoples. It embarked upon a new colonialism—Soviet style. This new colonialism has already brought under its complete control and exploitation many countries which used to be free. Moreover, the Soviet Union has refused to cooperate and has not allowed its satellites to cooperate with those nations it could not control.

In the United Nations, the Soviet Union has persisted in obstruction. It has refused to share in activities devoted to the great economic, social, and spiritual causes recognized in the United Nations Charter. For months on end, it even boycotted the Security Council.

These tactics of the Soviet Union have imposed an increasingly greater strain upon the fabric of world peace. Aggression and threats of aggression, aided and abetted by obstructionism in the United Nations, have caused grave concern among the nations which are honestly seeking peace. The response of the free world to the aggression in Korea has given those nations new confidence. But events in Korea have also made it more apparent than ever that the evil spirit of aggression is still abroad in the world. So long as this is true, we are all faced with a clear and present danger.

Today, we face a violent and cynical attack upon our democratic faith, upon every hope of a decent and free life—indeed, upon every concept of

human dignity. Those who support this evil purpose are prepared to back it to the limit with every device, including military force.

The Soviet Union and its colonial satellites are maintaining armed forces of great size and strength. In both Europe and Asia, their vast armies pose a constant threat to world peace. So long as they persist in maintaining these forces and in using them to intimidate other countries, the free men of the world have but one choice if they are to remain free. They must oppose strength with strength.

The Task To Maintain Peace

This is not a task for the United States alone. It is a task for the free nations to undertake together. And the free nations are undertaking it together.

In the United Nations, Secretary of State Acheson has proposed a plan for "Uniting For Peace," to make it possible for the General Assembly to act quickly and effectively in case of any further outbreak of aggression.³

In our own country, and in cooperation with other countries, we are continuing to build armed forces strong enough to make it clear that aggression will not pay.

Our military establishment moved the necessary men and supplies into Korea, 5,000 miles away, in an amazingly brief period of time. This remarkable accomplishment should not delude us into any false sense of security. We must be better armed and equipped than we are today if we are to be protected from the dangers which still face us.

We must continue to increase our production for military purposes. We must continue to increase the strength of our armed forces—Army, Navy, and Air Force. We must devote more of our resources to military purposes, and less to civilian consumption.

All this will be difficult, and it will exact many sacrifices. But we are aware of the dangers we face. We are going to be prepared to meet them. Let no aggressor make any mistake about that. We value our independence and our free way of life in this country and we will give all that we have to preserve them. We are going ahead in dead earnest to build up our defenses. There will be no let-down because of the successes achieved in Korea.

As we go forward, let us remember that we are not increasing our armed strength because we want to. We are increasing our armed strength because Soviet policies leave us no other choice. The Soviet Union can change this situation. It has only to give concrete and positive proof of its intention to work for peace. If the Soviet Union really wants peace, it must prove it—not by glittering promises and false propaganda, but by

living up to the principles of the United Nations Charter.

If the Soviet Union really wants peace, it can prove it—and could have proved it on any day since last June 25th—by joining the rest of the United Nations, in calling upon the North Koreans to lay down their arms at once.

If the Soviet Union really wants peace, it can prove it by lifting the iron curtain and permitting the free exchange of information and ideas. If the Soviet Union really wants peace, it can prove it by joining in the efforts of the United Nations to establish a workable system of collective security—a system which will permit the elimination of the atomic bomb and the drastic reduction and regulation of all other arms and armed forces.

But until the Soviet Union does these things, until it gives real proof of peaceful intentions, we are determined to build up the common defensive strength of the free world. This is the choice we have made. We have made it firmly and resolutely. But it is not a choice we have made gladly. We are not a militaristic nation. We have no desire for conquest or military glory.

Economic Progress for Asia

Our national history began with a revolutionary idea—the idea of human freedom and political equality. We have been guided by the light of that idea down to this day. The forces of Communist imperialism dread this revolutionary idea because it produces an intolerable contrast to their own system. They know that our strength comes from the freedom and the well-being of our citizens. We are strong because we never stop working for better education for all our people, for fair wages and better living conditions, for more opportunities for business, and better lives for our farmers. We are strong because of our social security system, because of our labor unions, because of our agricultural program. We are strong because we use our democratic institutions continually to achieve a better life for all the people of our country.

This is the source of our strength. And this idea—this endlessly revolutionary idea of human freedom and political equality—is what we held out to all nations as the answer to the tyranny of international communism. We have seen this idea work in our own country. We know that it acknowledges no barriers of race, or nation, or creed. We know that it means progress for all men.

The international Communist movement, far from being revolutionary, is the most reactionary movement in the world today. It is violently opposed to the freedom of the individual because, in that Communist system, the state is supreme. It is equally opposed to the freedom of other nations because, in that Communist system, it is Soviet Russia which must be supreme.

³ BULLETIN of Oct. 23, 1950, p. 655.

When General MacArthur and I discussed the whole problem of peace in the Far East, we recognized that this is far more than a military problem.

Today, the peoples of the Far East, as well as peoples in other parts of the world, are struggling with the false revolution of communism. Soviet communism makes the false claim to these peoples that it stands for progress and human advancement. Actually, it seeks to turn them into the colonial slaves of a new imperialism. In this time of crisis, we ask the peoples of the Far East to understand us as we try to understand them. We are not trying to push blueprints upon them as ready-made answers for all their complicated problems. Every people must develop according to its own particular genius and must express its own moral and cultural values in its own way.

We believe that we have much in common with the peoples of the Far East. Their older civilizations have much to teach us. We hope our new developments may be helpful to them.

We know that the peoples of Asia cherish their freedom and independence. We sympathize with that desire and will help them to attain and defend their independence. Our entire history proclaims our policy on that point. Our men are fighting now in Asia to help secure the freedom and independence of a small nation which was brutally attacked.

We know that the peoples of Asia have problems of social injustice to solve. They want their farmers to own their land and to enjoy the fruits of their toil. That is one of our great national principles also. We believe in the family-size farm. That is the basis of our agriculture and has strongly influenced our form of government.

We know that the peoples of Asia want their industrial workers to have their full measure of freedom and rising standards of living. So do we. That is the basis of our industrial society in this country.

We know that the peoples of Asia have problems of production; they need to produce more food and clothing and shelter. It is in this field that we can make a special contribution by sharing with others the productive techniques which we have discovered in our own experience.

We are not strangers to the Far East. For more than a century, our missionaries, doctors, teachers, traders, and businessmen have knit many ties of friendship between us. If we can be of help, we are ready to offer it—but only to those who want it. Through the Economic Cooperation Administration, Point 4, and in many other ways, we are trying to help the peoples of other countries to improve their living standards. We will continue these programs in cooperation with the United Nations. Even as we undertake the necessary burdens of defense against aggression, we will help to expand the work of aiding human progress. Otherwise, measures of defense alone will have little value.

We seek full partnership with the peoples of Asia, as with all other peoples, in the defense and support of the ideals which we and they have written into the Charter of the United Nations. This is the partnership of peace.

I have spoken to you tonight about some of the things which all of us are thinking about as we press ahead to finish our job in Korea. At a time when our forces under General MacArthur are locked in combat with a stubborn enemy, it is essential for us to understand what our broad purposes are and see clearly the kind of world we seek to build. As your President, I realize what it means to the homes of America to have the youth of our land called to meet aggression. These are the most solemn decisions and impose the heaviest responsibility upon those who must make them. I have told you tonight why we must do what we are doing. We hate war, but we love our liberties. We will not see them destroyed. We want peace, but it must be a peace founded upon justice. That American policy is as old as our Republic, and it is stronger today than ever before in our history. We intend to keep it that way.

THE CONGRESS

Legislation

American-Flag Shipping on the Great Lakes. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Maritime Affairs of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries H. R. 7474, 7503-21, 7527-29, 7531, 7532, 7536, 7551, 7556, 7581, 7582, 7620, 7639, 7692. Bills to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes. Mar. 29, 30, 31, Apr. 4, 5, May 18, 23, 1950. (Department of State, p. 279.) 81st Cong., 2d sess. 281 pp.

Civil Government for Guam. Hearing before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 185—A bill to provide a civil government for the island of Guam, and for other purposes. S. 1892—A bill to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes and H. R. 7273—An act to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes. Apr. 19, 1950. 81st Cong., 2d sess. 69 pp.

State Department Employee Loyalty Investigation: Individual Views. S. Rept. 2108 Part 2, 81st Cong., 2d sess. [Pursuant to S. Res. 231, a resolution to investigate whether there are employees in the State Department disloyal to the United States] 34 pp.

Authorizing the President To Control the Anchorage and Movement of Foreign-Flag Vessels in Waters of the United States When the National Security of the United States Is Endangered. S. Rept. 2118, 81st Cong., 2d sess. [To accompany S. 3859] 3 pp.

General Provisions General Appropriations Act, 1951. Hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, 81st Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 7786. An act making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes. 177 pp. (Indexed)

(Continued on page 704)

Seven Nations Propose Means To Unite and Keep the Peace

by John Foster Dulles
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly¹

I know that I speak for all of the sponsors of the seven-power draft resolution when I express gratification at the response to our proposals. When we introduced that proposal, we had hoped and thought that our resolution had expressed the manifest desire of all the peoples that we should really do something to create what our Charter refers to as "effective collective measures." We now feel that the hope with respect to the strong world-wide demand is realized because the general debate, which is now drawing to a close, shows that, with very few exceptions, all the representatives want the peace to be protected by something which is more solid than pious words.

The general debate here has indeed, to a very large extent, taken for granted the desirability of the goals that we seek through the seven-power draft resolution and, to a considerable extent, has revolved around the question of whether this General Assembly has the power, consistent with the Charter, to recommend the creation and, if need be, the use of armed forces as United Nations units.

I will not go into the legal questions which involve an interpretation of the language of the Charter, not because that is not important, but because it has already been dealt with so thoroughly by many able analysts. They have shown conclusively the constitutionality of what we propose. They showed that, while obviously the Security Council has the primary responsibility and alone has the power to act in an authoritative way, to impose economic, military, and diplomatic sanctions as contemplated by chapter VII, the General Assembly, nevertheless, has broad residual power under article 10 and other articles to recommend, either to the members, or to the Security Council with respect to "any matters within the scope of the present Charter" subject only to the one qualification that the Security Council is not dealing

with the matter at the moment. That, of course, is a qualification which the General Assembly has always respected and which I am sure it will always respect.

Review of San Francisco Article 10

The legal arguments have been developed so fully that I shall not repeat them. I shall, however, attempt to reinforce them by a few rather practical observations. In my opening remarks, I recalled that at San Francisco there was a bitter and final controversy with reference to the authority of the General Assembly. It revolved around this article 10. The result, as represented by the present language, was until the last moment, desperately resisted by the Soviet Union. As I think back to that time, I wonder why it was that the Soviet Union delegation held out until the last moment and indeed threatened not to sign the Charter at all because article 10 was so broad. If, in fact, article 10 only means what Mr. Vyshinsky says it means, if it means that this General Assembly cannot really do anything of any consequence, if it means that all it can do is to utter fine words and, that it cannot do anything with regard to action of consequence, why did we have this great struggle at San Francisco?

I know why we had that struggle at San Francisco because I was there and took part in the negotiations, and I know that struggle took place because the Soviet Union then realized that the broad scope, given to the Assembly by article 10, meant that in reality their veto in the Security Council would not necessarily be the final word in behalf of this organization. That is the explanation, and the only reasonable and intelligent explanation, that can be given regarding the debate that then took place on article 10. I know, of my own knowledge, that that was the reason for it.

I recall that at San Francisco on June 21, 1945, the day following the final concession by the Soviet

¹ Statement made before Committee I (Political and Security), on Oct. 13 and released to the press by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. on the same date.

Union with reference to the drafting of article 10, the chairman of the Australian delegation, speaking before the Second Commission of the Conference, said of the then finally agreed language of article 10:

There is no limit on the power of recommendations save the one mentioned in the text, and the Assembly may make recommendations on these matters to the United Nations. Of course those recommendations will have no operative effect in any country and questions of procedure will have subsequently to be determined. . . . Mr. President, I am not going to attempt any definition of so wide a Charter as this Assembly will possess. In fact, Mr. President, in my opinion, it is so wide that if I state how wide it is, there may be some attempt to re-open the question.

The Soviet Union representatives, then sitting in that Commission, heard those words and they then made no attempt to reopen the question, but they do so now, after 5 years. Well, they are 5 years too late. For the clear and then agreed wording of article 10 has been accepted and has been reflected in many acts of the Assembly.

On more than one occasion, we have here recommended the taking by the members of measures which the Security Council alone had the power to command under article 7. A number of these cases have already been referred to in the course of the general debate, and I shall refer only to one of those which has been mentioned before, namely, the case of Franco Spain.

The Question of Spain

I recall, that in April 1946, the Polish delegation brought to the Security Council a complaint against the activities of Franco Spain on the ground that the regime endangered international peace and security. The Polish delegation then demanded that the Security Council vote to require the members of the United Nations to invoke one of the sanctions mentioned in chapter VII, namely, "the severance of diplomatic relations." That proposal failed in the Security Council, and then what happened. Immediately the Polish delegation brought its proposal to the General Assembly, and asked the Assembly to recommend the imposition of the sanctions that the Security Council had refused to command. It introduced the proposal that the General Assembly should recommend to the members that they should break off diplomatic relations with the Spanish Government. The delegation of the Byelorussian S.S.R. went a step further, and urged that the Assembly should recommend to its members that they impose economic sanctions upon the Franco regime.

Both of those proposals were supported wholeheartedly and vigorously by the representative of the Soviet Union. I recall that Mr. Gromyko then said to us in reference to these proposals, particularly the Polish proposal:

It had been claimed in the Security Council that the General Assembly should take action, but now it was being

stated in the General Assembly that the matter was within the competence of the Security Council.

Then Mr. Gromyko went on to say:

The General Assembly had the power and the right to consider and take a decision on this problem, and a policy of inaction would have grave consequences.

Soviet Attitude on Unanimity

Only a few days ago, the Soviet Union brought to this Assembly, although the Security Council is concurrently sitting right across the hall, an agenda item entitled "American aggression against China." The explanatory memorandum, document A/1382, refers to a series of alleged acts which it said constitute a serious threat to international peace and security and call for immediate action by the United Nations.

That is, as I say, a proposal brought by the Soviet Union to the General Assembly when the Security Council is sitting a few feet away across the hall. Apparently, it is the view of the Soviet Union delegation that the General Assembly does have power to recommend action by member states when that action is in the interests of the Soviet Union. But, no, the Council cannot recommend action which, as is the case with the action now under discussion, might be inconvenient to the Soviet Union. If we accepted such an interpretation of the Charter, I think that we should, indeed, go back to kindergarten.

Mr. Vyshinsky went on to say that our proposals were dangerous because they did not reflect the necessity for unanimity between the permanent members of the Security Council. That unanimity, he said, is the "cornerstone," the "foundation," of the United Nations. Well, really! Is it the cornerstone, the foundation of this United Nations that there shall be unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council? Of course, it is one of the things we want and one of the things that we hope for, but to say that it is the foundation of this organization is, indeed, an extraordinary statement, and it means that if that is the foundation of this organization, then, unhappily, the United Nations has no foundation at all, because, regrettably, there is not today that unanimity.

Foundation of the United Nations

I do not know how they do things in the Soviet Union. Sometimes it seems that things are somewhat inside-out there. I know that with us the practice is to start with the foundation and then build on it. And where do I find in the Charter this rule, this foundation of the United Nations? I look to the Charter. I begin at the preamble, I read on through articles, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and finally I reach the middle and come to article 27. Where is it in article 27? Is it in paragraph 1? No. Is it in paragraph 2? No. Tucked

away in paragraph 3 of article 27 is a provision which says that on substantive matters action of the Security Council requires the concurring votes of the five permanent members. There, tucked away in the middle of the Charter, is what, to the Soviet Union, is the foundation of the United Nations. As I say, I do not understand this inside-out, upside-down process. I find the foundation of the United Nations in its opening paragraph, in its beginning, and in its preamble which expresses the determination of the peoples of the world—

to mite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and

to ensure . . . that armed forces shall not be used, save in the common interest. . . .

I say that the foundation of this United Nations is not found in the rule of the big five but in the determination of the peoples of the world expressed—and so eloquently expressed—in the preamble to the Charter of our organization. That determination of the peoples is our foundation. It is the determination that still persists, and the determination which the members of the United Nations have the duty to implement through the Charter, which gives them the right to supplement it through recommendations which, although not self-operating as are those taken by the Security Council, are nevertheless effective if, as we do not for a moment doubt, they respond to the will of the peoples whose determination is expressed here and is the true foundation of this organization.

Mr. Vyshinsky says that our proposals "would explode and crush the Charter." I say that the views expressed by him "would explode and crush the peace." They would be notice to every potential aggressor that this organization is impotent to create a collective resistance to aggression, even by suggesting a voluntary creation and coordination of armed forces which is obviously desired by the peoples of the world.

I do not doubt that there are those among us and elsewhere who will be struck by the fact that the only strong opponent of our proposals for collective resistance to aggression is the great power which in recent years has been largely aggrandizing the area of its domain. And some will at least wonder if that coincidence is purely coincidental.

A second and relatively minor legal argument relates to the question of whether this Assembly can decide now to meet in emergency session in the event of a future contingency that we defined, namely, failure of the Security Council to deal with a breach of the peace, coupled with the judgment of seven members of the Security Council that such an emergency meeting is desirable.

It is said that the suggestion that we should agree now, if that contingency happens, is illegal because it is said in article 20 that there shall be special sessions—

. . . at the request of the Security Council or of a majority of the Members of the United Nations.

And it is said that as far as the Security Council is concerned that that requires not just the vote, the action of seven members, but the concurring vote of the five permanent members so that such a call is subject to veto.

That is again an illustration of how tightly some of the permanent members would pull the noose of the veto that would strangle us. Article 27, which treats of the veto, says that:

Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.

That is, it means any seven members. And what are procedural matters? I would assume that the Charter was a guide to that.

Procedural Matters

What is the caption in the Charter before article 20? This word is "Procedure." It is indeed strange, concerning the veto, to contend that although article 27 says that any seven members can act on procedural matters, and although the Charter itself labels article 20, dealing with the calling of special sessions of the General Assembly, as procedural, that, nevertheless, is again vetoable.

Most of us here recall that in the spring of 1949 the General Assembly, by a vote of 43-6, with 2 abstentions, expressed, at least as far as we were concerned, that decisions in this respect should be deemed procedural matters. I refer to resolution 267 (III).

I think that this whole line of argumentation misses the point and is perhaps only significant as indicating the extremes to which the veto would be pushed.

The point, as I see it, is that the General Assembly can decide for itself when it will meet. It is the master of its own procedure and if we want, by an appropriate vote, we can decide and decide now to meet on any future contingency we name. Article 20, to be sure, states certain cases where we can be compelled by the Security Council to meet whether we want to or not. The Security Council by a vote of seven members can compel us to meet. But we are not talking about meeting under compulsion. We are talking about meeting when we want to meet, and surely we have the right to decide when we want to meet, and surely the Security Council has no right to veto us. If we decide now that it is important that the General Assembly should meet in special emergency session, in the event of a breach of the peace, as found by certain persons, surely it is right for us now and lawful for us now to decide to meet then. We would be meeting pursuant to our own volition and pursuant to our own vote, in the event of a contingency, which may come about and which we foresee if it does happen, will be grave enough so that there will be held instantly a special emergency meeting of the General Assembly.

Clarifying Legal Aspects

Those are legal questions that have been argued, the question of whether article 10 means what it says and, the question of whether we have the right to determine for ourselves if we will meet in the event of a defined future contingency.

I turn now to matters of substance, not dealing with them in detail, because the occasion for that will come later. I merely say now that a number of amendments have been proposed and considerable elements of those amendments are looked upon by the sponsors as constructive, helpful, and within the spirit of what we have in mind, and are acceptable to us. We hope to prepare promptly and to submit to the First Committee a revised draft resolution which will incorporate certain of the proposals that have been made here. I hope that they will, among other things, satisfy certain doubts that have been raised with reference to the precise role of the collective measures committee which is dealt with in part D of our proposal.

I should say here, in case there is any doubt, that, of course, it was never at all in the minds of the sponsors that this Committee would have the task either of surveying natural resources, prying into military secrets, or engaging in secret military planning. If we failed in our drafting to make that point clear, we welcome the opportunity to clarify our views in that respect and to remove any doubts that may exist in the minds of any.

Our revised draft resolution will also take account of what, I think, is a very legitimate point made here with regard to safeguarding the constitutional procedures of some of the member states. That concern was safeguarded by article 48 of the Charter, which dealt with action, and we agree that it should also be safeguarded by our draft resolution.

As I said yesterday, the sponsors are in the process of agreeing with the delegation of Chile, so that there will be no competition, but rather co-operation between the two resolutions.

There are other amendments which, after careful study, the sponsors do not feel that they can accept, and these will no doubt have to be submitted to the vote of this Committee, which is the way in which differences of opinion can be and ought to be resolved.

One of the proposals submitted during the course of the general debate is the Soviet proposal, document A/C.1/579, which, I gather, is a substitute for the portions of the seven-power resolution which the Soviet Union rejects. It calls for the—

rapid application of articles 43, 45, 46, and 47 of the Charter of the United Nations relating to the placing of armed forces at the disposal of the Security Council by the States Members of the United Nations and the effective operation of the Military Staff Committee.

Mr. Vyshinsky, in his address introducing those proposals said:

We have to implement Chapter VII of the Charter and we have to see to it that the Military Staff Committee shall finally buckle down to work and tackle this question which will determine the broad lines of the special military agreements to be concluded under Article 43.

Well, when Mr. Vyshinsky demanded that the Military Staff Committee should buckle down to this problem, there had then been 17 consecutive meetings of the Military Staff Committee, all of which were conspicuous by the absence of the representative of the Soviet Union. The next day, after this new Soviet Union proposal was introduced, another meeting of the Military Staff Committee was held. Then, at least, we thought there would be a representative of the Soviet Union present. It was, however, the same story. For the eighteenth consecutive time, following the eloquent appeal of Mr. Vyshinsky, following the introduction of his draft resolution that the Military Staff Committee should buckle down to work, the seat of the Soviet Union remained vacant. Well, of course, if we want satisfaction, we can go back, no doubt, to those words which still resound in our ears, the eloquent words of Mr. Vyshinsky, "let the Military Staff Committee buckle down to this task," which words will resound and resound and may satisfy us. But really, are we bobby-soxers who swoon when our modern Frank Sinatra croons?

Pending Seven-Power Resolution²

As we pass from this general debate to a detailed section-by-section study of the proposals, I hope we will not, in discussing the details, lose sight of the great purpose that underlies the pending seven-power resolution, a purpose which has so often been so eloquently expressed in the course of the general debate. The action which is contemplated is indeed momentous. It may determine, perhaps decisively and finally for our generation, whether or not the nations of the world really want an effective, as against a paper, system of collective resistance to aggression. Much, indeed, will depend upon what we do here.

We are indeed engaged in a serious affair. I am confident that the detailed discussion will confirm what the general debate has so clearly shown, namely, that the overwhelming majority of our members do want to unite their strength in a common defense which can, however, be brought into operation only as the Security Council or, if it fails, as this body, reflecting world opinion, judges to be right. The goal is security based on collective strength and subject to law. The proposals before the Committee, while not perfect, nevertheless, do seem to the sponsors to be the closest thing we can realistically get at the present time to achieve the result of collective strength under law.

I hope that the representatives will never forget

² BULLETIN of Oct. 23, 1950, p. 655.

in the course of this discussion the tremendous significance of creating a collective force, drawn not just from the great powers but also from the small powers, so that it represents all of our membership, and subjecting that force, which is drawn from the great, as well as the small, to the common, representative, moral judgments that are reflected by the United Nations. Never before, in the history of the world, has there been anything like that.

We have seen, over the past, a succession of military alliances primarily made by the great powers, and in every case the use of that strength was directed primarily by the self-interest of the great powers who made the greater contribution. But never have we had in history what is proposed here: a collective force in which some may contribute more than others but where the use of that force is determined not by individual states or by individual powers but by the collective judgment of mankind as represented by the appropriate organs of this organization.

There are some who profess to fear the power of the United States. We remind any such representatives that the United States placed its power in Korea at the service and subject to the will of the United Nations, and the purpose of this draft resolution is to assure, even more fully for the future, that armed force will be available

for the common interest, but, in the words of our Charter,

shall not be used, save in the common interest.

Two other so-called great powers, the United Kingdom, and France, are among the cosponsors of this historic proposal to put the strength, even of the great, under the collective judgment of the United Nations. What are the alternatives before us? If, at this time of admitted peril, the United Nations in this General Assembly hesitates to recommend ways whereby its members can unite their strength to maintain international peace and security, what will happen? We all know what will happen. There will inevitably be increased dependence on military alliances, the strength of which will not be subject to law or to any such representative universal body as this United Nations. There can, under those circumstances, be no comparable assurance that aggregations of power outside this organization will be as responsive to the over-all welfare of the peoples of the world as can be assured by this organization. That is why the rejection of these proposals would, in my opinion, have grave consequences, and, in dealing with them, we assume a grave responsibility. If, as I confidently believe, we accept these proposals, we shall be opening to all mankind a new vista of hope.

Current United Nations Documents: A Selected Bibliography¹

Security Council

Cablegram dated 22 August 1950 From the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea Addressed to the President of the Security Council and to the Secretary-General transmitting Report No. 1 of the "Commission of the United Democratic Fatherland Front for the Investigation of Crimes of the United States Interventionists and the Syngman Rhee Clique". S/1719/Rev. 1. 15 pp. mimeo.

Letter dated 15 September 1950 From the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan to the President of the Security Council Transmitting His Report. S/1791, September 15, 1950; [Also, Rev. 1 of September 26.] 37 pp. mimeo.

¹ Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

The United Nations Secretariat has established an *Official Records* series for the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and the Atomic Energy Commission; which includes summaries of proceedings, resolutions, and reports of the various commissions and committees. Publications in the *Official Records* series will not be listed in this department as heretofore, but information on securing subscriptions to the series may be obtained from the International Documents Service.

Letter dated 21 September 1950 From the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to the Secretary-General Concerning the Palestine Question. S/1824, September 29, 1950. 7 pp. mimeo.

General Assembly

Question of the Majority Required for the Adoption by the General Assembly of Amendments to and Parts of Proposals Relating to Important Questions. A/1356, September 11, 1950. 12 pp. mimeo.

United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine. General Progress Report Dated 2 September 1950 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. A/1367, September 22, 1950. 70 pp. mimeo.

Reservations to Multilateral Conventions. Report of the Secretary-General. A/1372, September 20, 1950. 40 pp. mimeo.

Budget Estimates for the Financial Year 1951. Salary, Allowance and Leave Systems of the United Nations. A/1378, September 19, 1950. 39 pp. mimeo.

Draft Convention on Freedom of Information. Note by the Secretary-General. A/1380, September 21, 1950. 5 pp. mimeo.

Registration and Publication of Treaties and International Agreements. Report of the Secretary-General. A/1408, September 29, 1950. 8 pp. mimeo.

Permanent Financial Regulations of the United Nations. Third report of 1950 of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. A/1412, September 30, 1950. 14 pp. mimeo.

Expenses of the Permanent Central Opium Board: Assessment of Non-Members of the United Nations, Signatories of the Convention of 19 February 1925 Relating to Narcotic Drugs. A/1418, October 6, 1950. 12 pp. mimeo.

Public Notices Affecting U.S. Property in Germany¹

Regulation No. 3 Concerning Certain Liabilities of the Iron and Steel Undertakings

Pursuant to the provisions of United States/United Kingdom Military Government Laws No. 75 "Reorganization of German Coal and Iron and Steel industries," the Council of the Allied High Commission issues the following regulations:

Article I

Indebtedness incurred on and after the effective date of this regulation by any iron and steel undertaking subject to the provisions of said laws No. 75, and which shall have been approved by the Combined Steel Group of the Allied High Commission, for the purpose of financing the acquisition, renewal, replacement, repair or improvement of any fixed assets which shall subsequently be transferred to a company formed in accordance with the provision of Article 3 of said laws shall be assumed by the company to which such assets shall be so transferred to the extent that the moneys provided from the indebtedness so incurred shall have been expended for said approved purpose.

Article II

Indebtedness incurred on and after the 10 November 1948, in the normal course of business of any iron and steel undertaking which shall be subject to the provisions of said laws No. 75 for the purpose of financing current operations of such undertaking and not in excess of such aggregate amount as shall from time to time be specified by said Combined Steel Group shall be assumed by the company or companies formed in accordance with the provisions of Article 3 of said Laws to which the current assets of such undertaking shall be transferred in such amounts not in excess of the then current market value of the current assets so transferred as shall be determined in the plan of reorganisation approved by said Combined Steel Group and under which such assets shall be so transferred.

Article III

For the purposes of this regulation, the term "current assets" means "Umlaufvermögen" as defined in section 131 of the German Aktionsgesetz of January 30, 1937, and the term "current market value" means the fair selling price of the particular assets at the time of their transfer as aforesaid.

Article IV

This regulation shall apply in the U. K. and U. S. Zones of Occupation and shall become effective on 1 January 1950.

Designation of the Implementing Agency for Decartelization and Deconcentration

The Council of the Allied High Commission decides as follows:

Article I

The Decartelization and Industrial Deconcentration Group of the Allied High Commission shall be the agency responsible for the implementation of British Military Government Ordinance No. 78, United States Military Gov-

ernment Law No. 58, and French Military Government Ordinance No. 96, in place of the Bipartite Decartelization Commission of the Bipartite Control Office and the Commission for Deconcentration of German Economy of the French High Command in Germany.

Article II

Order No. 2 of the British Military Government issued pursuant to Military Government Ordinance No. 78, Order No. 2 of the United States Military Government issued pursuant to Military Government Law No. 58, and Decree No. 40 of the French commander-in-chief in Germany, as amended by Decree 69—creation of a Commission for Deconcentration of German Economy—are hereby cancelled.

Article III

This decision shall be deemed to have become effective on 21 September, 1949.

Done at Bonn, Petersberg—Allied High Commission for Germany.

Judicial Powers in the Reserved Fields, Law No.13

Article 1

The Council of the Allied High Commission enacts as follows:

Except when expressly authorized, either generally or in specific cases, by the High Commissioner of the Zone in which the Court is located, German Courts shall not exercise criminal jurisdiction:

(a) (i) Over the Allied Forces:

(ii) Over persons accredited to the Allied High Commission, a High Commissioner or a Commander of any of the Occupation Forces and the members of their families:

(b) In respect of any offence alleged:

(i) To have been committed against the person or the property of any person or organization included in subparagraph (a) hereof;

(ii) To have been committed against enactments of the Occupation Authorities;

(iii) To have arisen out of or in the course of performance of duties or services with the Allied Forces.

Article 2

Except when expressly authorized, either generally or in specific cases, by the High Commissioner of the Zone in which the Court is located, German Courts shall not exercise jurisdiction in any non-criminal case:

(a) In which any of the parties is within the purview of Article 1(a);

(b) In which the issues to be decided include any matter arising out of or in the course of performance of duties or services with the Allied Forces.

Article 3

1. No German Courts shall render a decision which impeaches the validity or legality of any legislation, regulation, directive, decision or order published by the Occupation Authorities or any Authority to which they have succeeded.

2. Whenever any question as to existence, terms, validity or intent of any order of the Occupation Authorities or Forces or of any Authority to which they have succeeded or as to the applicability of Articles 1 or 2 of this Law to any person or property must be decided, the German Authorities concerned shall forthwith suspend further action and refer such question to the Occupation Authorities. The appropriate Occupation Authorities or any Occupation Court to which they may refer such question shall issue a certificate determining it. Such certificate shall be binding on the German Authorities.

¹ 15 Fed. Reg. 1052 ff., 156 ff. For other notices, see BULLETIN of Aug. 21, 1950, p. 314, and Aug. 28, 1950, p. 350.

Article 4

1. All proceedings and every decision taken by a German Court on any matter excluded from its jurisdiction shall be null and void.

2. A High Commissioner may validate retroactively any judicial or extrajudicial act taken in his Zone in contravention of the provisions of Article V of Military Government Law No. 2 or of Article 2 of Ordinance No. 173 of the French Commander-in-Chief in Germany.

Article 5

Where the German Authorities require the production of any document in the possession or under the control of any person or organization within the purview of Article 1 (a) or the presence of any such person as a witness, they shall make application to the Authority designated for this purpose by the Council of the Allied High Commission.

Article 6

The Occupation Authorities may require the production of any German Court records, files and other documents and attend the hearing of any case in any German Court, whether or not heard in public, whenever such Authorities consider the interests of the Occupation to be involved.

Article 7

1. The Occupation Authorities may, either generally or in specific cases, withdraw from a German Court, any proceeding directly affecting any of the persons or matters with the purview of paragraph 2 of the Occupation Statute.

2. The Occupation Authorities may suspend any decision of a German Court directly affecting any of the persons or matters within the purview of paragraph 2 of the Occupation Statute or of Article 1 (a) of this Law.

3. The Occupation Authorities may take such measures as they may deem necessary for the determination of cases withdrawn from the jurisdiction of German Courts pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article. In particular, they may transfer such cases to Occupation Courts.

4. An Occupation Court exercising jurisdiction under this Article shall have the power:

(a) To confirm, nullify or modify any proceeding, decision, judgment, sentence or execution order of a German Court;

(b) To direct a trial or retrial of the case in a German Court.

5. Every judgment or decision of an Occupation Court in any case withdrawn from a German Court shall be binding on all German Courts and Authorities shall not be subject to review by German Courts.

Article 8

In cases outside the jurisdiction of German Courts under this Law, no German Authority may, except when expressly authorized either generally or in specific cases by the Occupation Authorities, impose any penalty or coercive measure of any description.

Article 9

1. The powers vested in the Occupation Authorities by Article 3, paragraph 2, and Articles 6, 7, and 8 of this Law will be exercised:

(a) By the Allied High Commission in cases coming before a Federal Court or Authority;

(b) By the High Commissioner in cases coming before any other Court or Authority in his Zone.

2. The Allied High Commission and each High Commissioner may delegate the exercise of their respective powers under this Law to any person or authority designated for such purpose.

Article 10

In every case, both criminal and noncriminal, the period during which the German Courts have been deprived of jurisdiction by reason of the provisions of any legislation of the Occupation Authorities or of any Authority to which they have succeeded shall not be included in calculating any legal time limit.

Article 11

Each High Commissioner may take such measures as he may deem necessary to provide for the determination of cases which under this Law will not be within the jurisdiction of the German Courts.

Article 12

The Allied High Commission or the Authority designated by it shall exercise the powers of a High Commissioner under this Law with respect to the special area directly under the Allied High Commission at the seat of the German Federal Government.

Article 13

The Occupation Authorities may issue regulations implementing this Law.

Article 14

1. The provisions of Control Council Law No. 4 (Re-organization of the German Judicial System) are hereby deprived of effect in the territory of the Federal Republic.

2. The following Legislation is hereby repealed:
British Military Government Law No. 2 (German Courts).

British Military Government Ordinance No. 20 (Jurisdiction of German Courts in respect of Offenses against Military Government Enactments) and Regulations thereunder.

British Military Government Ordinance No. 29 (Limitations upon the Jurisdiction of German Courts).

British Military Government Ordinance No. 104 (Advisory Opinions of Control Commission Courts of Appeal).

British Military Government Ordinance No. 174 (Interpretation of Military Government Orders).

Article 119 of British Military Government Ordinance No. 165 and the Schedule to the Ordinance (Jurisdiction of Administrative Courts in the British Zone).

Article XXVIII of British Military Government Ordinance No. 175 and the Schedule to the Ordinance (Re-establishment of Finance Courts).

Ordinance No. 173 of the French Commander-in-Chief in Germany (Distribution of Jurisdiction between Occupation Courts and German Courts and Regulations of the Control of German Justice).

United States Military Government Law No. 2, as amended, and all Regulations and Authorizations issued thereunder (German Courts).

3. Cases in which action has been taken by the Occupation Authorities prior to the effective date of this Law pursuant to any of the legislation repealed thereunder may be disposed of in accordance with such legislation.

Article 15

This law shall come into force on 1 January 1950.
Done at Bonn, Petersburg, on 25 November 1949.

B. H. ROBERTSON,
U.K. High Commissioner for Germany.

A. FRANCOIS-PONCET,

French High Commissioner for Germany.

GEORGE P. HAYS
for JOHN J. McCLOY,

U.S. High Commissioner for Germany.

[The foregoing notices were deposited for the Secretary of State by Geoffrey W. Lewis, Acting Deputy Director, Bureau of German Affairs, on February 17, 1950.]

Interim Directive Under Allied High Commission Law No. 13, "Judicial Powers in the Reserved Fields"

The following directive, subject as above, was approved by the Deputy High Commissioner on January 24, 1950.

Pursuant to the authority conferred by Allied High Commission Law No. 13 "Judicial Powers in the Reserved Fields," and pending further action thereunder by the Allied High Commission or the United States High Commission for Germany, it is directed as follows:

1. Except as provided in Article 1 (a) of Allied High Commission Law No. 13 German courts are hereby expressly authorized to exercise criminal jurisdiction in the following cases:

a. Any case involving an offense against the Allied Forces and in which the maximum penalty that may be imposed by fine does not exceed 150 Deutsche Marks and the maximum penalty that may be imposed by detention does not exceed six weeks; and

b. Any case involving an offense against the property of the Allied Forces, if the value of the property stolen or unlawfully possessed, or the amount of damage or injury to the property, does not exceed \$100.00.

2. German courts shall not be debarred from exercising criminal jurisdiction in any case merely because the alleged offense is a violation of any enactment of the Occupation Authorities.

3. German Courts may, in accordance with applicable German law, issue penal orders (Strafbefehle) against persons other than those referred to in Article 1 (a) of Allied High Commission Law No. 13: *Provided*, That in cases where the accused is a national of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland or the Republic of France or a Displaced Person or a person with a status assimilated to that of a Displaced Person, the case will be transferred for trial to a United States Court of the Allied High Commission for Germany if the accused shall file a petition for such transfer at or before the stage of the proceedings at which, under German law, objections to such penal order may be made.

4. The exercise of the powers of the United States High Commissioner to authorize the exercise of jurisdiction by German Courts in specific cases pursuant to Articles 1 and 2 and of the powers of withdrawal of German Court proceedings and suspension of German court decisions pursuant to Article 7, paragraphs 1 and 2, of Allied High Commission Law No. 13, is hereby delegated to the Land Commissioners: *Provided*, That such powers may be exercised only within the framework of policies established before January 1, 1950, by the Office of Military Government for Germany (US) or by the Office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany or of instructions to be communicated to the Land Commissioners.

This directive shall take effect as of 1 January 1950 within the Laender of Bavaria, Bremen, Hesse and Wuerttemberg-Baden.

Done at Frankfurt on Main, on 24th January 1950.

(S) George P. Hays,
(T) GEORGE P. HAYS,

Major General, U. S. Army, Deputy
U. S. High Commissioner for Germany.

(S) A. G. SIMS,
Acting Director, Office of Administration.

Directive Under Allied High Commission Law No. 13

Pursuant to authority conferred by Allied High Commission Law No. 13, "Judicial Powers in the Reserved Fields," and pending further action thereunder by the Allied High Commission or the United States High Commissioner for Germany, it is hereby directed that, except as they may be expressly authorized to do so by the appropriate United States Land Commissioner, German courts shall not exercise criminal jurisdiction over any national

of the United States of America, or the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland or the Republic of France or over any displaced person or person having a status assimilated to that of a displaced person.

This directive shall become effective on 1 January 1950 within the Laender of Bavaria, Bremen, Hesse and Wuerttemberg-Baden.

Done at Frankfurt on Main, on 28 December 1949.

JOHN J. McCLOY,
United States High Commissioner
for Germany.

[The foregoing notices were deposited for the Secretary of State by Geoffrey W. Lewis, Acting Deputy Director, Bureau of German Affairs, on March 10, 1950.]

Freedom Ceremony at Berlin

The following press release was received on October 17 from the United States Information Service at Berlin.

Millions of radio listeners throughout the world will hear the chimes of the freedom bell ring out a message of hope at the conclusion of a historic ceremony before Berlin's city hall at noon, October 24, in the climax to the Crusade for Freedom to strengthen the faith of democratic citizens in all countries.

The broadcast from Berlin will touch off the most widespread and dramatic bell-ringing in history, for church and school bells will sound throughout Western Europe and the outside world.

The ceremonies in Berlin, where the giant bronze bell will be permanently enshrined in the city hall's tower—the citizens of Berlin will be entrusted with its custodianship—will be attended by a galaxy of leading diplomatic and political personalities of Europe and the United States. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, the organizer of the Berlin airlift which defeated the Soviet blockade, and national chairman of the Crusade for Freedom, will participate in the ceremony. The bell is presently en route to Bremerhaven aboard the U.S.N.S. *General Blatchford*, Freedom Ship which has brought 13,833 displaced persons and refugees from East European terror to safety and sanctuary in the United States. General Clay, accompanied by a delegation of members of the Crusade for Freedom National Committee, will arrive at Berlin on the morning of October 24. The ceremony, which will begin at 11:00 a. m. before the city hall, will include addresses by John J. McCloy, United States High Commissioner for Germany; Maj. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, United States Commander, Berlin; and Prof. Ernst Reuter, Lord Mayor of Berlin. At the conclusion of the ceremony, at 12 o'clock sharp, the bell will be rung; its chimes to be carried to all parts of the world by radio.

Oppressed citizens behind the iron curtain are expected to draw the outline of a bell on walls, much as the "V" sign which was scrawled across Europe during the last war, while their more fortunate neighbors will join in bell-tolling ceremonies throughout the outside world.

U.S. Attachés Detained by Rumanian Militia

[Released to the press October 19]

An example of the petty harassment to which American officials are subjected by public authorities in countries of the Soviet orbit is provided by an incident which recently took place in Rumania.

In the course of an automobile drive, Lt. Col. Franklin G. Rothwell, United States military attaché, and Gordon Mason, attaché of Legation, were detained by the Rumanian militia in Urziceni and held under armed guard for 6 hours, during which time they were not allowed to communicate with the Legation.

Urziceni is a small town 50 kilometers from Bucharest and does not come within areas described by the Rumanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs as prohibited. The local militia agreed that the officers were not traveling in a restricted area and refused to give reasons for the arrest other than to say that they were acting under orders from the Director General of the Rumanian militia.

The Legation immediately communicated with the Rumanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, strongly protesting the detention of United States officials and requesting that appropriate measures be taken to prevent any recurrence of such action against members of the Legation.

In a later note, dated October 12, 1950, the Legation refuted the Rumanian Government's allegations that the two officers had violated minor traffic regulations and pointed out that the Rumanian authorities had absolutely no right, in any circumstances, to arrest and detain them.

The United States, like any other nation, has the right to expect that its representatives abroad will be granted courteous treatment in accordance with long-recognized diplomatic practice. The Rumanian Government, like any other government, has the duty to accord such treatment and to maintain in its conduct of relations with other countries at least the minimum standards of international comity. The present incident is one of many which illustrate the deliberate policy of the existing Rumanian regime to insult and harass American official representatives in that country.

East German Elections Denounced as Fraud

[Released to the press October 13]

The American Government has taken cognizance of the resolution adopted by the Parliament of the German Federal Republic denouncing the

fraudulent nature of the sham elections to be conducted by the East German puppet government next Sunday and renewing the call for free all-German elections. The High Commissioners of the three Western Allied nations, acting on behalf of their Governments, have given their full endorsement to this resolution and have forwarded it to the highest Soviet representative in Germany, General Chuikov.

The American Government and the American people sympathize with the demand of the German people for the unification of Germany through democratic processes. The resolution of the German Federal Parliament at Bonn calls for free elections in all parts of Germany for a national constituent assembly which, in turn, would give rise to an all-German government.

The Soviet-installed East German government, afraid to face the will of the people in an honest election, has felt it necessary to stage some sort of show of balloting. But it is obvious that the October 15 performance lacks any characteristic of a free election. It will simply amount to a forced show of hands for the government in power and, by its very nature, will fail to indicate the true opinions of any of the participants. The real feelings of the people of East Germany are better expressed by the recent unofficial ration-card poll in which nearly half of the registered voters of East Berlin risked Communist reprisals to register their opposition to the Communist regime and to the sham elections.

The American Government and people will continue to give their sympathetic support to the people of East Germany in their unrelenting demand for a free and honest election.

Statement by Secretary Acheson

[Released to the press October 20]

The world has just witnessed the spectacle of the election fraud staged in the Soviet zone of Germany. Our sympathy goes out to the East German people who have been treated in such a contemptuous and humiliating fashion by their oppressors.

Resignations of Ambassadors Douglas and Thurston

On September 23, 1950, the President accepted the resignation of Walter Thurston as American Ambassador to Mexico. For texts of Ambassador Thurston's letter of resignation and the President's reply, see White House press release of that date.

On September 26, 1950, the President accepted the resignation of Lewis W. Douglas as American Ambassador to the Court of St. James. For texts of Ambassador Douglas' letter of resignation and the President's reply, see White House press release of that date.

U.S. and Brazil Enter Cultural Agreement

CEREMONY OF SIGNING AND SUMMARY OF AGREEMENT

[Released to the press October 17]

A bilateral convention, formalizing and strengthening cultural relations between the United States and Brazil, was signed today at 11:00 a.m. by Secretary Acheson and the Brazilian Ambassador to the United States, Mauricio Nabuco.

The convention is the first bilateral cultural agreement to be entered into by the United States. It originated from a joint statement issued on May 21, 1949, by President Truman and President Dutra of Brazil, during the latter's visit to the United States, expressing their desire for a treaty to "encourage and further stimulate" the present cultural exchange between their countries.¹

State Department officials pointed out that the working intent of the convention is exemplified in the Luso-Brazilian Colloquium, which will open Wednesday at the Library of Congress. The Conference will bring together Brazilian, Portuguese, and American scholars to discuss research problems in various fields of the Portuguese-speaking world.

The bilateral convention is motivated by the two countries' acceptance of the constitution of the United Nations Scientific, Educational and Cultural Organization and of the Charter of the Organization of American States, expressing aims to "facilitate free cultural interchange by every medium of expression." The United States and Brazil are also signatories to the convention for the promotion of Inter-American cultural relations, signed in 1936 at Buenos Aires and providing for multilateral cultural exchange between the United States and 16 of the other American Republics.

The convention signed today stresses the "bonds of friendship and understanding existing between the people of the United States of Brazil and of the United States of America." Its 13 articles cover Brazilian-United States relations in the fields of art, education, travel, the exchange of books, and visual aids.

¹ BULLETIN of May 29, 1949, p. 695.

Both countries are given the right to establish and maintain in each other's territory such cultural agencies as institutes, information offices, libraries, and film centers. Each is urged to encourage in its educational institutions, lectures on the other's language, literature, history and civilization and to make available qualified lecturers for such purposes.

Increased interchange of United States and Brazilian students, professors, and specialists and the promotion of scholarships, fellowships, and travel grants are also proposed.

Under the convention, each country undertakes to aid, so far as feasible, music festivals, art and scientific exhibits, theatrical and other events, reflecting the arts, crafts, and cultural achievements of both nations. The agreement also seeks the "closest collaboration" for the purposes of bringing together the peoples of the United States and Brazil and of fostering a mutual understanding of their intellectual, artistic, scientific, civic, and social lives.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY ACHESON

[Released to the press October 17]

It is gratifying for me to sign the document which gives form to the desires expressed by the Presidents of the United States of America and of the United States of Brazil for an instrument to broaden the long-existing cordial relations between our countries.

We might say that this first bilateral cultural convention of our Government is already bearing fruit. As an immediate example of the kind of activities it is to foster, we can cite the Luso-Brazilian Colloquium, beginning in Washington tomorrow. The Conference will bring together distinguished scholars from several countries for mutual discussion of cultural affairs in Portuguese-speaking nations of both hemispheres.

I feel confident that the cultural convention between the United States and Brazil will extend and strengthen our historic friendship and cooperation.

STATEMENT BY MAURICIO NABUCO

[Released to the press October 17]

It is highly gratifying to me to sign with Mr. Acheson, on behalf of the Brazilian Government, the cultural agreement between the United States of Brazil and the United States of America.

This cultural convention—the first bilateral cultural agreement, I believe, to be concluded by the United States of America—will certainly contribute in an objective way to a better and mutual knowledge of the values inherently attached to the traditions of Brazilians and Americans.

I am convinced that it will promote a closer understanding between our two countries, since its purposes are highly constructive and since it will be implemented in the atmosphere of traditional cordiality which has always presided over the relations between our peoples.

TEXT OF CONVENTION

[Released to the press October 17]

The President of the United States of America and the President of the United States of Brazil:

In consideration of the bonds of friendship and understanding existing between the peoples of the United States of America and of the United States of Brazil;

In view of the Joint Statement issued on May 21, 1949, by the President of the United States of America and the President of the United States of Brazil, expressing their desire for a treaty which would encourage and further stimulate the present cultural exchange between the two countries;

Inspired by the determination, demonstrated by acceptance of the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, to "develop and increase the means of communication between their peoples and to employ these means for the purpose of mutual understanding and a truer and more perfect knowledge of each other's lives";

And in fulfillment of the undertaking, set forth in the Charter of the Organization of American States, to "facilitate free cultural interchange by every medium of expression";

Have decided to conclude a Cultural Convention and have designated for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

For the President of the United States of America:

Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, and

For the President of the United States of Brazil:

Mauricio Nabuco, Ambassador of Brazil,
who, having exchanged their respective powers, found in good and due form have agreed as follows:

Article I

Each High Contracting Party shall foster, within its territory, such institutions as already exist or may be

created for the attainment of the objectives of this Convention, and will permit other organizations or private individuals to assist them voluntarily by means of financial or other aid.

Each High Contracting Party shall have the right to establish and maintain in the territory of the other High Contracting party such institutions and agencies, including institutes, information offices, libraries and film centers, as it may deem necessary or advisable to carry out the purpose of this Convention or of any agreement related or supplemental thereof.

Article II

Each High Contracting Party shall use its best efforts to extend to citizens of the other High Contracting Party engaged in activities pursuant to this Convention such favorable treatment with respect to entry, travel, residence and exit as is consistent with its national laws.

Article III

Each High Contracting Party shall encourage the giving, in the schools, universities and other educational or cultural establishments within its territory, of courses or lectures pertaining to the language, literature, history, civilization, institutions and cultural accomplishments of the people of the other High Contracting Party, in compliance with the local laws on education.

Each of the High Contracting Parties shall endeavor through its educational exchange services to make qualified lecturers and instructors available to institutions of the other High Contracting Party for the purposes of such courses of lectures.

Article IV

Each High Contracting Party shall encourage and facilitate the distribution and exchange of books, periodicals and other publications, including government publications, translations of such publications, musical compositions, works of art, reproductions of works of art, and other educational materials, including film and record collections, which will promote the purpose of this Convention.

Article V

Each High Contracting Party shall promote and facilitate the interchange between the United States of America and the United States of Brazil of students, trainees, professors, specialists and other qualified individuals, whether upon invitation or not.

Article VI

Each High Contracting Party shall, for the purpose of promoting to the fullest extent possible the interchange of persons referred to in Article V, encourage the establishment of scholarships, fellowships, travel grants and other forms of assistance in the academic and cultural institutions within its territory, and shall, insofar as feasible, make available to the other High Contracting Party information with regard to such assistance. Each High Contracting Party shall also endeavor to supply the other with information with regard to facilities, courses or other opportunities which might be of partic-

ular interest to nationals of the other High Contracting Party.

Article VII

Each High Contracting Party shall, within the limit of available funds and to the extent authorized by existing law, provide orientation courses and other appropriate services within its territory for nationals of the other state undertaking teaching, study or research, and shall encourage the institution of vacation courses for nationals of the other High Contracting Party.

Article VIII

Each High Contracting Party shall encourage the closest collaboration for the purpose of bringing together the peoples of the United States of America and the United States of Brazil and fostering a mutual understanding of the intellectual, artistic, scientific and social lives of the people of the two countries.

Article IX

Each High Contracting Party shall, to the extent feasible, take part and encourage its respective official and private institutions and nationals to take part in conferences, fairs, music festivals, art and scientific exhibits, theatrical events and similar activities held in the territory of the other High Contracting Party.

Article X

Each High Contracting Party shall undertake to facilitate and encourage the offering of prizes, honors or awards for literary and other artistic works on any aspect of its culture by nationals of the other High Contracting Party.

Article XI

The cooperation provided for in this Convention shall not prejudice in any way the work of any international agency for cultural cooperation of which either High Contracting Party may be a member, nor the development of cultural relationships between either High Contracting Party and any third state.

Article XII

The present Convention shall be ratified by the High Contracting Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements and shall come into force upon the exchange of the instruments of ratification, which shall take place in Rio de Janeiro.

Article XIII

The present Convention shall remain in force indefinitely, but may be terminated by one year's notice from either High Contracting Party to the other High Contracting Party.

Economic Outlook in India and Pakistan

by George C. McGhee

Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs¹

India and Pakistan are frequently thought of in conjunction with one another, not only because they share a subcontinent but because they emerged so recently into separate independence. Although the Indians and Pakistanis do share a great deal of history, there are important differences in their social and economic circumstances. It is well, therefore, to be careful before making generalizations which cover both countries.

First, I should like to say that the long-range prospects for India and Pakistan are distinctly favorable. In all the 5,000 years of civilization on this subcontinent, there have been few times when their outlook has been so dynamic. The people are on the move. They are determined to better their social and economic conditions. They intend to make their recently won independence a means to that goal. Their centuries-old feudal structure has been almost completely swept away.

Their land tenure system, built up over two centuries, is being revised. Both countries are fortunate in having able leaders, who are energetically seeking to improve conditions of life for their peoples.

The population of the subcontinent is intelligent, capable, and industrious. It includes Nobel Prize winners and outstanding leaders in science, literature, and the professions. Many have already proved to be excellent industrial workers when given adequate training. Although the population is very great, enormous natural resources remain unsurveyed or undeveloped. With these human and natural potentialities, and with the application of modern scientific techniques, the impetus which nationalism provides should result in the creation of an economy of mass production on a scale hitherto unknown.

Industrial and Natural Resources

India's mineral wealth is greater than most people realize. It includes reserves of "workable

¹ Excerpts from an address made before the Far East America Council of Commerce and Industry at New York, N. Y., on Oct. 20 and released to the press on the same date.

"coal" estimated at 16 billion tons. Relatively close to many of these rich coalfields, are iron ore deposits of excellent quality, estimated at 3 billion tons, or three-fourths those in the United States. Manganese reserves are estimated at 100 million tons, far more than the reserves of any country except the U.S.S.R. Three-quarters of the world's mica is produced in India, and that country also leads in production of kyanite, ilmenite, and monazite.

Indian munitions and textile factories played a significant role in the supply of Allied armies fighting in North Africa and Southeast Asia during the Second World War. Most of the factories of the subcontinent were located in the area which fell to India after partition in 1947. India's mills consume more cotton than those of the United Kingdom, and India normally exports about 10 percent of the cotton textiles entering world trade. In other words, India has an important industrial foundation on which to build.

Pakistan has a small oilfield in production, and there is hope that another field will be opened soon. Moreover, it is possible that further exploration will discover other important mineral resources. Pakistan's transport system is adequate, but it must build its industry almost from scratch. Pakistan has great agricultural resources, including an excellent irrigation system serving 20 million acres.

Economic Problems

These, in brief, are the industrial and natural resources on which India and Pakistan can build. I shall now turn to some of the immediate economic problems which these nations are attacking with energy and confidence.

One of India's principal problems is that of food production. India's agriculture yields from one-third to one-half as much per acre as that of the Western countries and Japan. In 1933, Sir John Megaw published the results of a medical survey into the dietary conditions of 600 typical agricultural villages in, what was then, British India. Serious undernourishment was reported from all provinces. Yet, in the period from 1934 to 1938, per capita food consumption was only 5 percent below the minimum target subsequently set by the Food and Agriculture Organization for tropical areas. Since that time, average consumption in India has fallen considerably and is now 18 percent below FAO standards. Unless improvements are made in Indian agriculture, there will be a continued fall in diet as the country increases in population by an estimated 5 million annually.

MANPOWER SHORTAGE

Another serious problem for both countries is that of finding managers, foremen, and even administrators for the many development projects which both have planned. Though the two Gov-

ernments have mobilized their trained manpower, they are well aware that even more Indians and Pakistanis with the requisite technical education are needed in order, adequately, to manage the industries, mines, hydroelectric projects, and other enterprises which they hope to undertake or complete in the next few years.

The low living standards in South Asia—as in many other parts of the world—are primarily the result of low productivity, which, in turn, is a consequence of inadequate education and training and of undernourishment and ill health. The average lifespan in India and Pakistan is less than half that of most Western countries, and disease is correspondingly more prevalent. These factors suggest the necessity of a simultaneous attack on inadequate food production, illiteracy, and disease.

FOOD SUPPLY

The trade dispute between the two countries poses additional problems. Traditionally, India has been a natural market for most of Pakistan's raw jute and cotton, as well as for its wheat surpluses. Although Pakistan has succeeded in disposing of last year's cotton crop without sale to India, her jute and wheat have not been sold so satisfactorily. Similarly, jute and cotton mills in India have had to operate at less than full capacity because supplies of these fibers, including those produced in India, were not adequate to keep the mills busy. Pakistan has been selling wheat to Germany, while India imports foodstuffs from countries thousands of miles away, including Australia, Canada, and the United States. Pakistan has imported coal from Poland, the United Kingdom, France, and South Africa, even though her needs could be supplied from India's rich coalfields only a few hundred miles away. Each country seems to be attempting to prove that she can exist without trading with the other, but the cost, in both cases, is very great.

LACK OF FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

Perhaps the most difficult problem facing South Asian development is shortage of capital. Although there are a few very wealthy Indians and Pakistanis, they are exceptions, and the aggregate of domestic capital available for investment is small. Accordingly, foreign investments have always been important to the economy of the subcontinent. Naturally enough, most of these investments were British. However, a fairly large proportion of British capital was repatriated during and after the war, a net outflow of foreign capital of 5 billion rupees in the decade 1939-1949. Foreign investment remaining in India alone was estimated in 1948 as 5.96 billion rupees, of which 72 percent was British and only 5.7 percent American. Although both India and Pakistan have given repeated assurances since their independence that foreign capital would be welcomed and

treated fairly, only a trickle of foreign private capital has gone into these two countries. Foreign investments, since independence 3 years ago, have totaled less than 20 million dollars, of which only a small fraction came from the United States.

Although India had a favorable balance of payments with the dollar area, as well as with the world as a whole, for part of 1949 and for the early part of 1950, this resulted from a strict import-licensing policy and from devaluation. Since that time, India's balance of trade has become unfavorable once more. Pakistan's highly favorable balance of payments in 1947 and 1948 has since become distinctly unfavorable. Although the release of sterling balances in the United Kingdom has, until now, cushioned the shortage of foreign exchange, both countries have spent a substantial portion of their balances. Both India and Pakistan have a real need for capital; and, while there are, of course, differences in internal policies, both Governments would welcome private capital from external sources for a wide range of enterprises. However, where private capital is not forthcoming, both Governments are determined to carry on their development with public capital, if necessary, by government loans from the International Bank or other foreign sources.

As I have said, leaders in this area are fully aware of their immediate problems. Social reforms of outstanding importance are taking place in both countries. Technical institutes are being established, to train engineers for new factories and other development projects. Teams from the World Health Organization are now working in both countries to improve the health of the people. Far-reaching land reforms are being implemented gradually in both countries. Although at present there are no provisions for the repatriation of American investments, profits can be taken out without great difficulty. Discussions have been held with India with respect to a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, and a draft has also been given the Government of Pakistan for its consideration. We would like to complete negotiations as soon as possible on a basis satisfactory to the United States and to the Governments of these countries.

PLANS FOR EXTENSIVE DEVELOPMENTS

In other fields of development, planning is going forward. India plans to increase food production by several million tons by 1952. The detailed plans call for extension of irrigation, improved use of fertilizers, increased clearing of cultivable jungle, and the reclamation of large areas which have been taken over by kans grass. A start was made in 1947 on the latter project by setting up a Central Tractor Organization and by the purchase of 222 American war-surplus tractors. New tractors have been added since.

The river valley schemes for the subcontinent

are broad in scope although they cannot yield results as quickly as the Indian projects which I have just mentioned. India alone plans to spend an estimated \$3,878,800,000 in the next two decades on these plans, beginning with an expenditure for the first year of nearly 200 million dollars. These great projects, perhaps partially inspired by our own Tennessee Valley Authority, are eventually expected to increase the cultivated area by 25 million acres and to generate 10 million kilowatts of power. The outstanding river development scheme is the Damodar Valley project, with an estimated total cost of 110 million dollars. This project alone is expected to add a power potential of 400,000 kilowatts.

With the rich iron and coal deposits, which I have noted, it is natural that India should plan to erect additional steel mills with a total capacity of a million tons. Machine tools, telephone equipment, locomotives, fertilizers, and penicillin are among the other principal products of factories covered by existing plans. The Indian Government has decided to undertake many of its industrial enterprises, chiefly, it appears, because private initiative has been lacking. Most observers agree, however, that the pace of industrialization and other development will be very slow if left entirely to Indian public or private capital resources.

Pakistan has correspondingly extensive development plans. The Government has wisely chosen to emphasize improvement in agriculture, transport, communications, and electric power, along with further processing facilities for Pakistan's raw materials such as cotton, jute, hides and skins, and cottonseed. According to a 1949 estimate by the Minister of Commerce, approximately 750 million dollars will be spent on development in the next 10 years. One outstanding project calls for the irrigation of 5 million acres in the Thal area, a semidesert in the western part of the Punjab. Two million acres will be given constant irrigation, enabling two crops per year to be grown, while 3 million acres will be irrigated at certain times of the year. The great Lower Sind Barrage scheme is expected, eventually, to transform another 2 million acres from desert to rich farming land.

Pakistan's plans also call for the erection of numerous dams for the production of increased hydroelectric power, some of which may be used for tubewells in the fight against waterlogging and salt encrustation in the irrigated portion of the Punjab and some which may be used for a paper mill in East Bengal. Considerable attention is also being devoted to improvement of ports, better communications, and more educational facilities, particularly training centers for technicians.

Private Pakistani enterprise has constructed several cotton mills and is now cooperating with the Government in erecting three jute mills in East Bengal. A sugar mill, with a capacity of 50,000

tons annually, has recently commenced operations, and another large vegetable oil mill is nearing completion, under joint ownership of local capitalists and a world-famous British firm. However, since private foreign and domestic capital has not yet come forward in Pakistan on an adequate scale, an Industrial Development Corporation has been set up by the Government to promote independent companies. This Corporation will subscribe such of the capital as the public does not take up, with the intention of disposing of the government interest in due course.

Program of Technical Assistance

The importance to the free nations of the world of the economic well-being of so vast and important an area as the subcontinent is universally recognized. One important means of enhancing the well-being of this area lies in the importation of technical assistance. Such technical assistance is being rendered by the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Labor Organization, and other United Nations agencies. This program will be coordinated with the Commonwealth Technical Cooperation scheme and with our own Fulbright, Smith-Mundt, and Point 4 programs. American private foundations and missionary societies have helped and are helping greatly in the field of education. Foreign business interests which have established offices in India and Pakistan offer specialized training to local employees and business associates. It is to be hoped that many of the more progressive companies will share their modern techniques of production and marketing with businessmen and industrial engineers of the region.

In addition to the importation of technical assistance, action is being taken on a cooperative international basis to attack the basic economic difficulties which confront this area. Representatives of the Commonwealth countries, including India and Pakistan, have recently discussed in London far-reaching development programs for South and Southeast Asia, including plans for Commonwealth technical aid and for a considerable measure of capital investment. The Commonwealth representatives have a wealth of experience in South Asia, and their developing plans appear to be statesmanlike in character and realistically related both to the needs and the resources of this area. It does, moreover, provide an impetus for planning and a basis for coordination among the states of South and Southeast Asia which has not hitherto existed.

The region clearly must receive an increased inflow of foreign capital if development plans are to be carried out. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has already made three loans to India, and a group of experts from the Bank has recently left for Pakistan. There will remain, however, a considerable gap

between the capital needs of the subcontinent and the present availabilities. It would accord with our principles of free enterprise for private capital to fill this gap. Unhappily, private capital has only partially met the challenge thus far, and, in view of world conditions, it is not likely that a large volume of private capital will flow from the United States or other developed countries into South Asia in the near future.

It is in the interest of the United States and of the free world that the resources of this area be developed for the people so that they can make economic progress, preserving and strengthening their democratic governments and their orientation toward the United Nations and the free peace-loving nations of the world. Although the magnitude of the capital needed in South Asia is much less than in more developed areas, the need is no less urgent. If, as is presently indicated, sufficient capital from foreseeable sources is not forthcoming to carry out the modest plans developed by these countries to meet their own needs, their problems will become more serious. This is not only vitally important for the nations directly concerned, but is of far-reaching international significance. The basic problem—that of the continuance of democratic institutions in South Asia—cannot fail to challenge the resourcefulness and initiative of the American Government and its people.

Military Assistance Agreement Concluded With Thailand

Statement by Ambassador Edwin F. Stanton

[Released to the press October 18]

United States Ambassador to Thailand, Edwin F. Stanton, on the occasion of the signing of a military assistance agreement between the United States and Thailand, on October 17, made the following statement at Bangkok.

As stated in the preamble of the military assistance agreement concluded this day between the Government of the United States and the Government of Thailand, it is the desire of both Governments to foster international peace and security within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations through measures which will further the ability of nations dedicated to the purposes and principles of the Charter to develop effective measures for self defense in support of those purposes and principles. Furthermore, the signing of this agreement is a practical expression of the willingness of the American people to help Thailand's people when they need help to maintain their traditional rights, liberty, and independence. By assisting them in the preservation of these rights, we shall advance a cause in which our two countries have a common stake—the cause of peace, and

freedom. This agreement is not a military alliance nor is it a defense pact. This agreement contains no provisions for military, naval, or air bases. The Government of Thailand has not offered such bases, nor has the Government of the United States ever requested such bases or any special concession.

This agreement follows the request by the Government of Thailand for arms and equipment to strengthen Thailand's forces with a view to enabling them better to defend Thailand and Thailand's people from any aggression which may threaten the peace and tranquility of this country. This request was made in the knowledge that aggressive forces are rampant in the Far East today and appear to be looking hungrily toward Thailand and her neighbors.

Both the people of Thailand and the American people have known what it means to struggle to achieve freedom and liberty—these supreme rights of man we are determined to defend and to preserve at all costs. It is in this spirit that the Government of the United States has responded to the appeal from the Government of Thailand and has decided to give army and military equipment which will replace old equipment now being used by the armed forces of Thailand and to supply a number of American officers and technicians for demonstration training purposes. It is my sincere hope that the assistance being extended by the Government of the United States will give the armed forces and people of Thailand a feeling of greater security and will engender unity of purpose between the army, the navy, and the air force for the greater good of Thailand. By preserving peace, Thailand's armed forces will not only insure progress and prosperity for the people of Thailand but will also be making a definite contribution to world peace.

U.S.-Indonesia Sign Economic Cooperation Agreement

[Released to the press October 17]

Dr. Mohammed Roem, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, and H. Merle Cochran, American Ambassador to Indonesia, on October 16 signed an agreement providing for economic cooperation between their two Governments. The agreement arises from recommendations made by the Economic Survey Mission led by R. Allen Griffin who visited Indonesia in April this year.

Indonesia is the third Asian state to enter into an economic cooperation agreement with the United States. The Government of the Union of Burma on September 13, and the Government of Thailand on September 19, this year, signed similar agreements.

The agreement sets forth measures which the

Government of the Republic of Indonesia and the Government of the United States will take in order to promote sound economic conditions and stable international relationships. It outlines understandings under which technical and economic assistance requested by Indonesia will be furnished. These provisions are designed to assure maximum benefits to the people of the Republic of Indonesia from assistance provided under the agreement.

As a result of discussions with Indonesian officials at the time of the Griffin Mission's visit to Indonesia, it was decided that assistance could advantageously be made available in the form of supplies and technical advice in fields of public health, agriculture, fisheries, industry, and education. The United States Government will furnish such assistance in these fields as may be desired by the Indonesian Government.

An initial request for urgently needed supplies has been prepared by the Indonesian Government. These supplies will include, for example, materials for small-holder rubber producers; agricultural tools, such as hoes and small plows; medical supplies, and motorized fishing vessels. These supplies will be obtained not only in the United States but also in such countries where they may be readily available.

The agreement will take effect upon approval of the Parliament of the Republic of Indonesia for ratification, which the Department has been assured will be expedited.

Lewis H. Van Dusen Named to NAC Staff

The Department of State announced on October 20 the appointment of Lewis H. Van Dusen, as Executive Director of the staff of the United States Deputy Representative to the North Atlantic Council, Charles M. Spofford. In this capacity, Mr. Van Dusen will be assigned to London and will perform such duties as may be assigned from time to time by the deputy representative.

Letters of Credence

Burma

The newly appointed Ambassador of Burma, James Barrington, presented his credentials to the President on October 11, 1950. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 1044 of October 11.

Point 4 Project in Iran Announced

[Released to the press October 19]

The first comprehensive technical cooperation project under the new Point 4 Program—an integrated health, agriculture, and education project for improving living conditions in rural villages in Iran—was announced today by the Governments of Iran and the United States.

The project, to be undertaken at the request of the Government of Iran, will be carried out under authority of the Act for International Development (Public Law 535) recently enacted by the Eighty-first Congress.

Supervision of the cooperative program will be exercised by an Iranian-U. S. Joint Commission for Rural Improvement, composed of four representatives of the Government of Iran and three representatives of the Government of the United States, with an Iranian member as chairman. The Commission will designate a technical director for the project and will determine what personnel and facilities are required for each country.

The United States has allocated \$500,000 for technical cooperation in Iran from the Point 4 appropriation for the current fiscal year. It is expected that the rural improvement program will require \$300,000 between now and June 30, 1951, with the remaining \$200,000 being available for expansion of this program or for undertaking other technical cooperation projects in Iran.

The Iranian Government will contribute personnel, land, buildings, and locally produced equipment to the cooperation program, in addition to funds for operating expenses. The United States will provide the services of agricultural, health, and educational experts and equipment not produced in Iran.

An integrated program with major emphasis on health, agriculture, and education will be carried out by American and Iranian personnel working together in rural villages near the principal centers of population. These centers will serve as demonstration and training areas, in which action programs will be carried out both to improve the living conditions and productivity of the inhabitants and to train Iranian teachers and demonstration agents who can apply the same methods in other villages.

Each demonstration area will be a nucleus from which the techniques for increasing food production, reducing disease, raising the education level, and otherwise improving the living conditions of the people will be gradually extended to other villages throughout Iran. These activities are essential to the general economic development of the country.

The first demonstration center will be established immediately and three more are expected to be in operation by next June 30. It is expected that 10

such centers will be in operation by June 30, 1952.

In addition to the new Iranian project announced today and other proposals under consideration by Ambassador Capus M. Waynick, acting administrator, Office of Technical Cooperation and Administration, Department of State, there are approximately 100 technical cooperation projects in operation under the Point 4 Program. Nearly all of these were begun under authority of prior legislation and were incorporated in the Point 4 Program under the terms of Public Law 535.

The Institute of Inter-American Affairs is conducting 25 of these projects in the other American Republics, and other agencies of the United States Government are conducting 72 projects. In connection with these programs, 412 American technicians were at work in technical cooperation projects in other countries during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950. During the same period, 597 nationals of other countries were brought to the United States for technical training. In addition, hundreds of technical and semiprofessional people were trained locally on cooperative projects in their own countries. The number of American technicians abroad and trainees in this country will increase substantially during this first year of the Point 4 Program.

The heads of United States diplomatic missions in about 60 countries have been authorized to receive requests from other governments for technical assistance from the United States under the Point 4 Program. These requests are discussed with the other government and transmitted to the Department of State with the recommendation of the United States chief of mission.

Each request is carefully studied by the Department of State and the appropriate technical agency in the United States Government. When a project has been approved by the Point 4 Administrator, an agreement is made between the two governments specifying the terms under which the work is to be carried out. These terms include the amount of money to be contributed by each government and the personnel, facilities, materials, and equipment each is to supply to the joint enterprise.

Upon conclusion of the agreement, technicians are assigned to the project by the appropriate technical agency of the United States Government, which provides technical guidance for the technicians while they are in the field. Selection of the technicians must be approved by the Department of State, which provides policy guidance and general direction to such personnel.

When the technicians report for work in the country to which they are assigned, they are responsible to the head of the United States diplomatic mission. It is expected that a technical cooperation officer will be designated in each embassy or mission where several projects are in operation to provide general supervision on the scene on behalf of the chief of mission.

Tax Treaty Negotiations With Finland

[Released to the press October 20]

United States and Finnish tax officials are expected to meet at an early date for technical discussions of possibilities for improving tax relations between the two countries and to consider whether a basis exists for conventions for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income and to taxes on the estates of deceased persons.

If a basis for conventions is found, drafts of the proposed terms will be prepared by the participants and submitted to their respective governments for consideration with a view to signing.

In preparation for the discussions, interested persons are invited to submit information and suggestions to Eldon P. King, Special Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Speeds Shipment of Arms Aid to France and Indochina

[Released to the press October 17]

In the course of conversations which have taken place during the last few days between Dean G. Acheson, Secretary of State; John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury; George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense; and William C. Foster, Economic Cooperation Administrator, on behalf of the United States, and Jules Moch, Minister of Defense, and Maurice Petsche, Minister of Finance, on behalf of France, a review has been made of the United States contribution to the implementation of the French rearment program within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This review has included the question of additional United States military aid to Indochina.

The United States Government has expressed the view that a military effort of the general magnitude and character planned by the French Government would be a vital contribution to the defensive strength of the North Atlantic area. Out of the sums appropriated by the United States Congress under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, for fiscal years 1950 and 1951, about 5 billion dollars have been earmarked for military equipment to be delivered to the European members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. France has been assigned by far the largest single part of these amounts.

In addition, the United States Congress has appropriated for military assistance in the Far East approximately one-half billion dollars. In view of the importance of the operations in Indochina, the major part of this sum is being used to

provide military equipment, including light bombers, for the armed forces both of France and of the Associated States of Indochina.

This assistance will provide a very important part of the equipment required by the forces contemplated for activation in 1951 in France and for current operations in Indochina. Deliveries of equipment are being expedited and, with respect to Indochina, a particularly high priority has been assigned.

Moreover, the following agreement has been reached during the talks with respect to production assistance:

(a) On an interim basis, and within the funds already appropriated under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act by the Congress for the fiscal year 1951, the Government of the United States will make available in support of the French Government's increased military production program assistance in the amount of 200 million dollars, these funds to be obligated prior to June 30, 1951.

(b) The final amount of American assistance to support the expanded French defense effort will, subject to future provision of funds by the Congress, be determined on the basis of multilateral discussions within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization directed toward an equitable distribution among all the North Atlantic Treaty members of the economic burdens of the common rearment effort.

Legislation—Continued from page 686

Independent Offices Appropriations, 1951. Hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, 81st Cong., 2d sess., making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes. 1136 pp. (Indexed)

Foreign Aid Appropriations for 1951. Hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, 81st Cong., 2d sess., making appropriations for foreign aid for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes. (Department of State, indexed) 647 pp.

Mutual Defense Assistance Program, 1950. Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate 81st Cong., 2d sess., on the Mutual Defense Assistance Program, 1950; June 2, 5, 6, and 15, 1950. (Department of State, pp. 1, 49, 74, 77-80) S. 81st Cong., 2d sess., 113 pp.

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, 81st Cong., 2d sess., on S. 2801. A bill to give effect to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949, and for other purposes. April 4 and 5, 1950. (Department of State, pp. 21, 44, 66) 120 pp.

Revision of the United Nations Charter. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 81st Cong., 2d sess., on resolutions relative to revision of the United Nations Charter, Atlantic Union, World Federation, etc., February 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 20, 1950. (Department of State, indexed) S. 81st Cong., 2d sess., 808 pp.

Authorizing Aid to Needy American Nationals in Connection With Their Repatriation From Foreign Countries. H. Rept. 2341, 81st Cong., 2d sess. [To accompany H. R. 8927] 14 pp.

Authorizing the President To Invite the States of the Union and Foreign Countries To Participate in the First United States International Trade Fair. H. Rept. 2343, 81st Cong., 2d sess. [To accompany H. J. Res. 453] 4 pp.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Advancement Toward Self-Government of Trust Territories

by John Sherman Cooper

Alternate U.S. Representative to the General Assembly¹

The United States, as a member of the Trusteeship Council, has had the opportunity of expressing its views upon substantive matters in the deliberation of the Council and in the report which is before us. The United States delegate in the Trusteeship Council approved the adoption of the Council report to the Assembly.

Accordingly, we will not comment at great length, at this time, upon the report, and our comments will be of a general nature.

The distinguished president of the Council and other delegates have drawn attention to the wide scope and intensity of the Trusteeship Council's activities during the year covered by its report. The special tasks assigned to the Council by the Assembly, such as those relating to Jerusalem, the Italian colonies, and the question of administrative unions, required extensive consideration. These assignments were carried out in addition to the performance by the Council of its supervisory role in the trusteeship system. This supervisory work, which may be characterized as the "normal" activity of the Trusteeship Council, involves the examination of the detailed reports of the administering authorities on the trust territories, the examination of a great volume of petitions, the organization of visiting missions and the examination of their reports. We would not contend that the work of the Trusteeship Council is to be evaluated alone by the volume of documentation or investigative activities. But it is essential that we take note of the exacting detail with which the members of the Council must inquire into every aspect of the administration of the territories

which come under their supervision, if a reasonable and fair judgment is to be made of its work.

My Government believes that the work of the Council during the past year has demonstrated that it is recognizing the responsibilities imposed upon it by the Charter to promote the advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories toward self-government and independence and that it has made progress toward its objectives.

We have listened with interest to the discussion of various aspects of the Trusteeship Council report by the representatives who have spoken in this debate. The United States delegation, as a member of the Trusteeship Council, welcomes the comments made with constructive purpose and intent during the course of this debate, and particularly on the part of members who are not seated in the Trusteeship Council and who, therefore, must utilize this forum as a means of expressing their views on this important aspect of the work of the United Nations. I should like to take this opportunity to comment on a few of the points raised by preceding speakers.

Problems Concerning the Trusteeship Council

Among the questions raised, a number of delegates have referred to the problem of the relationship between the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly. My delegation does not consider that it was intended by the creators of the Charter that the Trusteeship Council should become a sort of "rubber stamp" body with the function of merely adding its imprimatur to resolutions passed by the General Assembly. Article 7 of the Charter created the Trusteeship Council as one of the principal organs of the United Na-

¹ Statement made before Committee IV (Trusteeship), on Oct. 13 and released to the press by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. on the same date.

tions along with the Security Council, the General Assembly, and others. It was undoubtedly contemplated that the Council would provide a special knowledge and experience which would be exercised objectively and continuously. It is obvious that the Assembly and this Committee cannot examine in detail every specific situation which may arise. It is, therefore, the view of my Government that the Assembly should, in general, make broad recommendations of policy to the Council rather than upon matters of specific detail. Specific matters should be referred to the Council for study and with the request that the Council make appropriate recommendations to the administering countries based upon these studies.

A suggestion has been advanced that the Trusteeship Council should be requested to establish a standing committee to deal with petitions, administrative unions, and the reports of the administering authorities. As I have already stated, my Government believes that the Trusteeship Council, as presently organized, is an effective and efficient body which is steadily advancing in the performance of functions which are entrusted to it by the Charter. Article 9 of the Charter empowers the Trusteeship Council to adopt its own rules of procedure. The United States delegation believes, therefore, that the adoption of such a procedure would be inappropriate.

COUNCIL'S REPORTS

The rapporteur of the Committee, the representative of Norway, in his statement to this Committee, made a number of suggestions with respect to the work of the Council. My delegation was impressed by his observations regarding the desirability of closing the time gap between the period covered by the reports of the administering authorities and the examination of these reports by the Trusteeship Council. The members of the Committee will wish to know that at the seventh session of the Trusteeship Council it was unanimously agreed to consider this whole question during the Council's next session. My delegation is also prepared to give careful consideration to various suggestions, particularly the valuable suggestions of the representative of Denmark, which have been advanced with a view to the simplification and rationalization of the Council's report to the Assembly.

The distinguished delegate of India recommended certain changes in the consideration of reports of the Council that would result in extensive changes in the procedure heretofore followed by this Committee in its work. We consider his proposals important and upon his further elaboration expect to set forth our view on this proposal at a later date.

I have said earlier that the United States as a member of the Council welcomes the constructive comments which have been made during the course of this debate. It is true that uncritical praise is

not very helpful. We believe as strongly that the selection and denunciation of every defect, without any reference to the circumstances in which they are found, and without reference to any movement of progress and improvement, is unfair and cannot be called constructive criticism.

I must say frankly to the delegate of the U.S.S.R. that it would have been proper for his country to have made its criticisms in the Trusteeship Council. I say further that the expressed concern of his delegation and country for the non-self-governing peoples of the world would be better demonstrated by fulfilling the obligations it assumed as a member of the Trusteeship Council, which it has not discharged. This concern could be demonstrated by attendance at meetings of the Council and by making efforts to correct defects there rather than by mere denunciation and words in this body.

Certain of the observations of the Soviet representative were directed toward the administration by the United States of the trust territory for which it is responsible—the trust territory of the Pacific Islands. Since, as the report of the Trusteeship Council clearly points out, the work of the Trusteeship Council regarding the trust territory of the Pacific Islands is the subject of a separate report by the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council, my delegation has no intention of elaborating in this body its administration of the Pacific Islands. But in order that the record may be set straight and to give point to my statement that mere denunciation is valueless and inaccurate, I will state briefly the facts on the several points raised by the Soviet representative.

U.S. Administration of Trust Territories

The Soviet representative stated, as I understood it, that the indigenous inhabitants of the trust territory of the Pacific Islands have "no part at all" in the management of their own affairs. What is the true situation in this respect? The true situation is that the United States has already taken steps to promote the political advancement of the inhabitants in accordance with the Charter and the trusteeship agreements and that substantial steps have been taken in this direction on the local, regional, and territory-wide levels. In this territory of some 54,000 indigenous inhabitants residing on 96 distinct island groups, we have organized what our administrators call "municipalities" as basic units of local government. Over 100 such municipalities have already been established. Our objective is to organize at least one of these units of local government on each inhabited atoll or separate island. As the Trusteeship Council was informed, when the most recent report of the trust territory was examined, 135 of the principal officials then holding office in the municipalities had been selected by popular election. On the regional level, the Palau Congress has been functioning since July 4, 1947. The Mar-

shall Islands Congress has also been established. Steps have been taken in the direction of a Congress for the Ponape District and for the Northern Marianas. It is the intention of the administering authority to stimulate the organization of these and other regional bodies and to facilitate the establishment of a territorial council. The techniques of democracy, including the process of voting, are thus being utilized on an increasingly wider scale.

The Soviet representative stated that a "preliminary report" indicated that 90 percent of the inhabitants of the trust territory suffer from the disease of yaws. It is a fact that the figure of 90 percent was the estimate of the American medical authorities of the incidence of yaws at the time the United States undertook the administration of the trust territory. This situation has been ameliorated since that time due to the efforts of the United States. Now an open lesion of yaws is seen infrequently, probably in less than 1 percent of patients presenting themselves for treatment. The Soviet representative referred to the fact that only 90 subdispensaries had been established in the trust territory. This is certainly a creditable number in relation to the population of the territory, which amounts to approximately 54,000. In other words, there is one subdispensary for each 600 inhabitants. In addition to the subdispensaries, there are five main dispensaries and a mobile hospital ship, specially fitted out as a floating clinic and laboratory with the most modern equipment and staff of medical and dental officers and technicians. All of these facilities serve a population of only 54,000 scattered over 3 million square miles of the Pacific Ocean.

May I repeat that the foregoing facts are set forth in the report which the United States Government has submitted to the United Nations and which have been made available to the Soviet delegation.

Traditional U.S. Policy

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to reassert that the well-established policy of the United States is to support to the fullest extent the Charter of the United Nations, including those chapters relating to the non-self-governing peoples of the world. It is in accord with the deep aspirations of dependent peoples toward self-government or independence and believes that these aspirations must be realized within the framework of the Charter. At the same time, my Government will exercise constant vigilance to insure that the non-self-governing peoples do not fall prey to the new imperialism, which is unceasingly attempting to extend its tentacles over the free world.

This policy has been one which has been asserted and practiced by my country since its independence, and it will not depart from that policy.

All of us know that there are diverse views as

to the methods, the means, and the time necessary for the attainment of these objectives. The problem is complicated further by the undertones of deep emotions which must attach to the consideration of the fundamental hopes and aspirations of mankind and which spring naturally from our national histories and backgrounds.

Whatever our views may be as to the means by which our objectives may be attained, we are faced with the fact that all of these views were considered in the preparation of the Charter and that the plan which is available to us was adopted as we thought best to attain the aspirations of the non-self-governing people of the world.

It is the view of my delegation that emotion, bitter denunciation, or propaganda will not meet the issues with which we are concerned and, in fact, are a disservice to the people with whose welfare we are concerned. I emphasize that it is their welfare, their aims which are important and not the propagation of our views or interests. I was impressed by the honesty with which the distinguished delegate of Chile drew attention to the central interest. It is certain that in the course of the work of this Committee the positions that will be taken by various members and by the United States may not always be approved if viewed emotionally or upon a short-term basis.

I can only say that the United States will continue to attempt to discharge its obligations objectively, to fulfill its obligations to the non-self-governing peoples of the world, and to accelerate their advancement as rapidly as possible, in accordance with the provisions and spirit of the Charter.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

Intergovernmental Tin Conference

The Department of State announced on October 16 that the President has designated Clarence W. Nichols, adviser, Economic Resources and Security Staff, Department of State, as United States delegate to the United Nations Intergovernmental Tin Conference to be convened at Geneva, October 25, 1950. Other members of the United States delegation are:

Advisers

W. F. McKinnon, associate director, Office of Metals Reserve, Reconstruction Finance Corporation
Stanley D. Metzger, assistant to the legal adviser (Economic Affairs), Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State

William W. Tamplin, international trade economist, Foreign Minerals Region, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior

Erwin Vogelsang, Industry Operations Bureau, National Production Authority, Department of Commerce

Industry Advisers

Morris Foodim, Federated Metals Division, American Smelting and Refining Company, New York City
Anthony Siragusa, assistant to the vice-president, United States Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh

Secretary

Robert Read, attaché, American consulate, Geneva

The Secretary-General of the United Nations is convening this Conference "to discuss measures designed to meet the special difficulties which exist or are expected to arise concerning tin and, if considered desirable, to conclude an international commodity agreement." A draft international agreement on tin prepared by the International Tin Study Group will serve as a basis for the discussion. Although the United States has questioned the necessity of negotiating an agreement at this time, this Government has decided, because of its interest in the world tin position, to participate in the forthcoming Conference.

At the fifth meeting of the International Tin Study Group, held at Paris, March 20-29, 1950, representatives of the major tin-exporting countries expressed great concern over the fact that the world production of tin was substantially in excess of commercial consumption, that commercial stocks of tin were already unusually large, and that the future continuity and duration of the noncommercial demand for tin were subject to considerable uncertainty. After extensive discussion of these conditions, the International Tin Study Group adopted, by a vote in which only the United States was opposed, a resolution in which the Secretary-General of the United Nations was requested to convene a conference to discuss an agreement through which intergovernmental control would be exercised over international trade in tin.

Petroleum Committee (ILO)

The Department of State announced on October 19 that the following have been designated delegates to the third session of the Petroleum Committee of the International Labor Organization (ILO), which is to open at Geneva on October 24:

Government Representatives

Hersey E. Riley, chief, Division of Construction Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor
John L. Thurston, assistant administrator for program, Federal Security Agency

Employers' Representatives

C. Francis Beatty, director, Socony-Vacuum Oil Company, Inc.
John C. Quilty, Industrial Relations Department, Shell Oil Company

Workers' Representatives

Taylor Elliott, member of the International Union of Operating Engineers
George T. Sinn, Federal Labor Union No. 19199

At its third session, the Petroleum Industry

Committee will consider a general report on the action taken in various countries in the light of the conclusions of its first two sessions, on studies and inquiries carried out by the International Labor Office with respect to the petroleum industry, and on recent events and developments in the industry. The Committee will also discuss a special report on social conditions in the petroleum industry.

The Petroleum Committee is one of eight industrial committees established by the Governing Body of the International Labor Office. The other industrial committees are concerned with building, civil engineering, and public works; chemicals; coal mines; inland transport; iron and steel; metal trades; and textiles. Through the meetings of these committees, in which government, employer, and labor representatives from various countries participate, the International Labor Organization is able to give close attention to the economic and social problems of the respective industries. Delegates from the United States participated in the first session of the Petroleum Committee, held at Los Angeles, February 3-12, 1947, and also in the second session, held at Geneva November 10-19, 1948.

International Wheat Council

The Department of State announced on October 20 that the fourth session of the International Wheat Council will convene at Geneva on October 24, 1950, with the following United States delegation in attendance:

United States Delegate

Elmer F. Kruse, assistant administrator for commodity operations, Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture

Advisers

Gordon P. Boals, head, Grain Division, International Commodities Branch, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture
James C. Foster, Food Division, National Production Authority, Department of Commerce
L. Ingemann Highby, Economic Resources and Security Staff, Department of State
Paul O. Nyhus, agricultural attaché, American Embassy, London

Adviser and Secretary

Robert E. Menze, assistant chief, Wheat Agreement Staff, Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture

The agenda for this session of the International Wheat Council provides for (1) readjustment of the quotas of exporting countries because of quantities added to the quotas of importing countries; (2) consideration of possible changes in the rules of procedure of the Council; (3) consideration of operational procedures in the administration of the International Wheat Agreement in the light of the first year's experience; (4) review of the report of the Executive Committee and consideration of the contents of the annual report of the Council;

and (5) action on an application from Iceland for permission to accede to the agreement as an importing country.

The International Wheat Council was established in 1949 pursuant to the terms of the International Wheat Agreement of March 23, 1949, an instrument designed to assure supplies of wheat to importing countries and markets for wheat to exporting countries at equitable and stable prices. Administration of the provisions of the agreement is the primary function of the Council which is composed of 42 exporting and importing countries parties to the agreement. Each country may be represented on the Council by a delegate, an alternate, and such technical advisers as are necessary.

Geography, History, and Cartography

The Department of State announced on October 16 that there will be convened at Santiago, Chile, the fifth General Assembly of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, and, concurrently, the fifth consultation on cartography, the second consultation of geography, and the second consultation on history of the Institute's three subsidiary Commissions.

The Institute is an intergovernmental body which has as its purpose the development, coordination, and dissemination of geographical, historical, and related scientific studies and the initiation of investigations and activities pertaining thereto. It was established in 1929 pursuant to a resolution of the Sixth International Conference of American States and has become one of the specialized organizations of the Organization of American States. Previous assemblies of the Institute have been held in 1929, 1932, 1935, 1941, and 1946.

All 21 American Republics are members of the Institute, and since 1942, Canada has been represented at its meetings by observers. The United States became a member in 1935.

The Institute carries out its scientific activities through Commissions on Cartography, Geography, and History, each of which is composed of one representative from each of the American Republics.

The fifth General Assembly has on its agenda subjects of an administrative and fiscal nature, while the meetings of the Commissions will consider technical matters and future programs in each of the three substantive fields. The Commission on Cartography will consider such subjects as geodetic operations, gravity and geomagnetism, seismology, topographic maps and aerophotogrammetry, aeronautical charts, hydrography, tides, special maps, and urban surveys. Meetings of the Geography Commission will be divided into five sections on physical geography and biography, human geography, regional geography, methodology and teaching, and geography of the Americas. The meetings of the Commission on History will include sessions for the

discussion of historical topics, sessions of the committees on archives, folklore, the emancipation movement, and the revision of history texts, and sessions for the formulation of the Commission's program of studies and publications.

The United States Government will be represented at the meeting by the following delegation:

Chairman

Claude G. Bowers, United States Ambassador to Chile, Santiago

Vice Chairman

Robert H. Randall, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C., United States Representative on and Chairman of Commission on Cartography, Pan American Institute of Geography and History

Members

William Applebaum, Boston, Mass., Member, Panel on Geographic Research Techniques, Research and Development Board, Department of Defense

Dr. Rollin S. Atwood, Officer-in-Charge, Office of North and West Coast Affairs, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Department of State

Dr. Wallace W. Atwood, Jr., Acting Executive Director, Committee on Geophysics and Geography, Research and Development Board, Department of Defense

Arthur P. Biggs, Attaché (Geographer), United States Embassy, Santiago

Samuel W. Boggs, Special Adviser on Geography, Office of Intelligence Research, Department of State

Warren C. Crump, Assistant Chief Engineer, Hydrographic Office, Department of the Navy

Dr. Charles C. Griffin, Professor of Latin American History and Editor, *Hispanic-American Historical Review*, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Dr. Otto E. Guthe, Special Assistant to the Director, Office of Libraries and Intelligence-Acquisition, Department of State

Dr. Clarence F. Jones, Professor of Geography, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., Substitute United States Representative on the Commission on Geography, Pan American Institute of Geography and History

Col. Herbert Milwit, United States Army Representative, Joint Intelligence Group, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Defense

Col. Frank A. Pettit, Director, Inter-American Geodetic Survey, Caribbean Command, Balboa, Canal Zone

Dr. Rafael Pico, Chairman, Puerto Rico Planning, Urbanizing, and Zoning Board, San Juan, Puerto Rico

Murray Y. Poling, Chief, International Technical Cooperation Section, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce

Capt. Elliott B. Roberts, Chief, Division of Geomagnetism and Seismology, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce

Lt. Col. Charles V. Ruzek, Executive Officer, Army Map Service, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army

Col. Paul C. Schauer, Commanding Officer, Aeronautical Chart Service, Department of the Air Force

Dr. André C. Simonpietri, Special Adviser on Cartography, Office of Intelligence Research, Department of State

Dr. Arthur P. Whitaker, Professor of Latin-American History, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., United States Representative on the Commission on History, Pan American Institute of Geography and History

George D. Whitmore, Chief, Research and Technical Control, Topographic Branch, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior

Charles B. Hitchcock, Assistant Director, American Geographical Society, New York City

U.S. To Invoke "Escape Clause" Under GATT

[Released to the press October 18]

A Presidential proclamation will shortly be issued withdrawing, as of December 1, 1950, certain United States tariff concessions on women's fur felt hats and hat bodies, made in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, concluded at Geneva in 1947. This action will be taken under the "escape clause" (art. XIX) of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and will be the first case in which the United States has invoked this clause.

The action applies to women's fur felt hats and hat bodies valued at more than \$9 and not more than \$24 per dozen. It will restore, on these items, the tariff rates provided for in the Tariff Act of 1930, which range from 25 to 40 percent higher than the rates provided for in the General Agreement. A schedule of the categories affected, showing the present rates and those which will apply upon withdrawal of the concessions, is given below.

In recent years, imports of these products have come principally from Czechoslovakia, Italy, France, and the United Kingdom.

The proclamation will be issued in accordance with recommendations of the Tariff Commission, made after an investigation of the trade in women's fur felt hats and hat bodies. This investigation was conducted in response to an application by domestic producers of these articles for invocation of the escape clause, which provides that any party to the agreement may modify or withdraw a particular concession if it finds that, as a result of the concession and of unforeseen developments, imports of the product in question are occurring in such increased quantities and under such circumstances as to cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry.

The report of the Tariff Commission to the President states, among other things, that, since the reduction of the duties in 1948, imports of women's fur felt hat bodies have supplied a

progressively larger share of the domestic consumption and that domestic production has been materially smaller than before the war. Whereas imports throughout the 1930's and the immediate postwar years were equivalent to less than 5 percent of domestic production, they were equivalent to 7.2 percent in 1948 (the first year following the reduction in duty), 21.4 percent in 1949, and 30.5 percent in the first 6 months of 1950.

The escape clause in the General Agreement requires that any party invoking it shall notify the other parties of its action and shall consult with other contracting parties interested in the product. If the contracting parties affected do not agree upon the action as a result of such consultation, they may suspend substantially equivalent concessions which they have granted to the party invoking the escape clause, unless such suspension is disapproved by the contracting parties as a group.

The required notice in this case has been given to the other contracting parties, and the necessary consultations have been begun in Torquay.

Although the United States has negotiated tariff concessions on several thousand items that are subject to the escape clause, only 20 applications for its invocation have been received by the Tariff Commission. Eleven of these have been dismissed. Decision on six is pending. One has been postponed. Two investigations have been ordered. One investigation—with regard to spring clothespins—resulted in the recommendation that no action be taken.

Copies of the findings of the Tariff Commission, facts bearing on the findings, and the Commission's recommendations to the President are available. A limited number of copies of the report, together with additional data developed during the investigation, are available from the Tariff Commission.

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (Second Supplementary Announcement). Commercial Policy Series 131. Pub. 3944. 16 pp. 15¢.

Negotiations beginning September 1950 under the Trade Agreement Act of 1934 as amended and extended. Second supplementary notice of United States intention to negotiate; second supplementary list of products to be considered; notice of second supplementary public hearings.

United Nations Action in Korea Under Unified Command: Second Report to the Security Council, August 16, 1950. International Organization and Conference Series III, 55. Pub. 3955. 5 pp. 5¢.

Second report of the United Nations Command operations in Korea for the period July 20-31, 1950.

World Meteorological Organization. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2052. Pub. 3834. 79 pp. 25¢.

Convention and Related Protocol between the United States and Other Governments—Opened for signature at Washington October 11, 1947; entered into force March 23, 1950.

Food Production: Cooperative Program in Haiti. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2075. Pub. 3875. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Haiti modifying and extending agreement of August 28, 1944, as modified and extended—Effectuated by exchange of notes, signed at Port-au-Prince June 25 and 29, 1948; entered into force June 30, 1948.

Germany: Basic Principles for Merger of the Three Western German Zones of Occupation, and Other Matters. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2066. Pub. 3880. 29 pp. 15¢.

Agreements between the United States, France, and the United Kingdom—Signed at Washington April 8, 1949, entered into force April 8, 1949, except the Occupation Statute which entered into force September 21, 1949.

Mutual Aid Settlement. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2064. Pub. 3885. 23 pp. 10¢.

Agreements and exchanges of letters between the United States and Belgium—Signed at Washington September 24, 1946; entered into force September 24, 1946, and exchange of memorandums—Signed at Washington July 23 and September 24, 1946; entered into force September 24, 1946.

Surplus Property Settlement. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2070. Pub. 3886. 1 p. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Belgium amending agreement of September 24, 1946—Signed at Paris May 12, 1949; entered into force May 12, 1949.

Surplus Property Settlement: Joint Undertakings Under Agreement of September 24, 1946, as amended. Relating to Transfer of United States Surplus Property in Belgium, and Certain Other Agreements. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2074. Pub. 3887. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Belgium—Signed at Washington April 20, 1950; entered into force April 20, 1950.

Economic Cooperation With Austria Under Public Law 472—80th Congress, as amended. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2020. Pub. 3890. 9 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Austria amending agreement of July 2, 1948—Effectuated by exchange of notes, signed at Washington October 21 and November 30, 1949, and February 20, 1950; entered into force February 20, 1950.

Economic Cooperation With the British/United States Zone, Free Territory of Trieste Under Public Law 472—80th Congress, as amended. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2035. Pub. 3892. 9 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and the British/United States Zone, Free Territory of Trieste amending agreement of October 15, 1948—Effectuated by exchange of letters signed at Trieste December 27 and 28, 1949; entered into force December 28, 1949.

Colón Corridor. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2029. Pub. 3896. 9 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Panama—Effectuated by exchange of notes, signed at Panamá May 26, 1947; entered into force May 26, 1947.

United States Educational Commission in Austria. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2072. Pub. 3897. 12 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Austria—Signed at Washington June 6, 1950; entered into force June 6, 1950.

Military Mission to Costa Rica. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2079. Pub. 3903. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Costa Rica amending and extending agreement of December 10, 1945—Effectuated by exchange of notes signed at Washington February 3 and 15, 1950; entered into force February 15, 1950, operative retroactively from December 10, 1949.

Military Assistance to the Philippines. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2080. Pub. 3904. 7 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines supplementing and extending agreement of March 21, 1947—Effectuated by exchange of notes signed at Manila February 24 and March 11 and 13, 1950; entered into force March 13, 1950.

Correction

In the BULLETIN of October 16, 1950, page 628, there appeared an article by Catherine Corson Little entitled, "Preparatory Work for a United Nations Conference on the Control of Trade in Sugar." Mrs. Little served as adviser and secretary to the U.S. delegation to the International Sugar Council meeting in London and is in the Sugar Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture.

The United States in the United Nations

Review, September 15 to October 27

Although United Nations activities have for the most part centered about the General Assembly since the fifth session convened September 19, two of the other principal organs of the United Nations—the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council—have also been active during the past 6 weeks. The Councils of three specialized agencies have met, and two conferences are currently being held under United Nations auspices. In addition, this same period has seen certain milestones reached in the development of the United Nations.

Ambassador Warren R. Austin announced in an address on September 17 that the following day he would turn over to Secretary-General Lie a check for 4 million dollars—the first installment on the United States contribution to the United Nations Technical Assistance Fund.

Membership in the United Nations rose to 60 with the admission of the Republic of Indonesia on September 28. A sufficient number of ratifications or accessions to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide had been received by October 14 to bring the Convention into force on January 12, 1951.

Fifth Anniversary Heralded

The fifth anniversary of the coming into force of the United Nations Charter was celebrated throughout the world on October 24, United Nations Day. President Truman, addressing the General Assembly on this occasion, declared that "the people of the world rely on the United Nations to help them achieve two great purposes. They look to it to help them improve the conditions under which they live. And they rely on it to fulfill their profound longing for peace. He also recognized that the United Nations work for human advancement can never be fully effective until we can achieve a just and lasting peace, and he voiced his faith in the United Nations' ability to bring us nearer to that peace. When this goal has been achieved, he said,

man can turn his great inventiveness, his tremendous energies, and the resources with which he has been blessed to creative effort.

The President outlined the essentials of an effective system of disarmament and stated that until such a system is established the "only course the peace-loving nations can take in the present situation is to create the armaments needed to make the world secure against aggression." The United States in embarking on such a course, he said, has only "the purpose of helping to keep the peace" and pledges its growing armed strength "to uphold the principles of the Charter."

General Assembly

During the first 6 weeks of the fifth session, the General Assembly completed action on such regular agenda items as the elections to the Security, Economic and Social, and Trusteeship Councils as well as on one of the principal problems before it—the independence of Korea. The eight-power resolution adopted on October 7 recommended that a unified, independent, and democratic government be established in Korea and that all necessary measures for the economic rehabilitation of Korea be undertaken; that a United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea be set up; and that the Economic and Social Council be requested to develop plans for Korean relief and rehabilitation. That resolution laid the basis for future United Nations action in Korea. An interim committee of the new commission has since been meeting at the seat of the United Nations, while the old United Nations Commission on Korea continues to function in Seoul, pending the arrival of the new commission.

At the committee level, action has been completed on a second major proposal placed before this Assembly—the seven-power Uniting for Peace resolution introduced by the United States—and also on a number of other important agenda items, but final approval on these committee decisions by the Assembly meeting in plenary session is pending.

Following approval on October 19 by an overwhelming vote on the seven-power resolution which provides for special emergency sessions of the General Assembly and which establishes a Peace Observation Commission and a Collective Measures Committee, and also recommends that members maintain elements within their national armed forces for use on behalf of the United Nations, Committee I (Political and Security) the same day adopted a Soviet resolution recommending that the Security Council proceed with the implementation of articles 43, 45, 46, and 47 of the Charter regarding the placing of armed forces at the Council's disposal and the effective functioning of the Military Staff Committee. Two days later it adopted unanimously a revised Iraq-Syrian resolution recommending that the permanent members of the Security Council meet and discuss all problems likely to threaten international peace. With this decision, the committee completed its work on the second item on its agenda—United Action for Peace.

Decisions reached in other Assembly Committees to date cover a wide range of problems. The *Ad Hoc* Political Committee has approved a resolution condemning Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania for failing to fulfill their treaty obligations in connection with their alleged violations of human rights and a resolution looking toward establishing Libya as an independent state by January 1, 1952, in accordance with the resolution passed by the Assembly's fourth session. A resolution approved by the Joint Committee (II and III) and Committee V expresses the hope that all member states not taking part in the work of the specialized agencies will "assume or resume" their full participation. Two resolutions have been approved by the Social Committee (III)—one expanding the United Nations Advisory Social Welfare Services and another continuing the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund on its present basis for another 3 years. Committee VI (Legal) has approved a permanent invitation to the Arab League to be represented by an observer at the General Assembly. Other committee decisions relate to varied problems, such as the equitable distribution and proper utilization of land in trust territories, the administrative budgets of specialized agencies, and the question of reservations to multilateral conventions.

Committee I is currently considering the agenda item, Declaration of the Removal of the Threat of a New War and the Strengthening of Peace and Security among Nations, proposed by the U.S.S.R. Discussion has centered about a Soviet "Peace" declaration and a counterproposal introduced jointly by Netherlands, France, Lebanon, Mexico, the United States, and the United Kingdom.

Under the Soviet proposal, the General Assembly would condemn warmongering, prohibit the use of atomic weapons, brand the first government using such weapons a war criminal, and recom-

mend to the five permanent members of the Security Council that they conclude a peace pact and reduce their present armed forces by one-third during the next year. The joint proposal of which the United States is a cosponsor would, on the other hand, have the Assembly determine that "for the realization of lasting peace and security it is indispensable: 1. That prompt united action be taken against aggression; 2. that every nation agree (a) to accept effective international control of atomic energy under the United Nations on the basis already approved by the General Assembly in order to make effective the prohibition of atomic weapons, and (b) to regulate all armaments and armed forces under a United Nations system of control and inspection, with a view to their gradual reduction."

The *Ad Hoc* Political Committee on October 20 opened debate on the agenda item proposed by Cuba concerning recognition by the United Nations of the representation of a member state. The Committee has before it a Cuban draft resolution which sets up four criteria for an Assembly decision on this matter, a British proposal under which the right of a government in control of a territory and having the obedience of the population to represent the member state would be recognized, and a Dominican draft referring the question of representation to the International Law Commission, together with numerous proposed amendments.

In the general debate on this question, Ernest A. Gross (U.S.) took the position that "no list of standards can be prepared which is exclusively or automatically applicable to a particular situation." He declared that the "most that can be hoped for is a broad statement of criteria which among others is of universal application" and urged preliminary consideration of the question by a representative subcommittee. On October 26, a 15-member subcommittee, on which the United States is represented, was appointed to examine this question in the light of the proposals made and the views expressed in the course of the preceding debate.

Two sessions of the Joint Committee (II and III), meeting with Committee V, have been held during the past week to consider problems of co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies. Committee III is now discussing the draft Covenant on Human Rights on the basis of four questions referred to the Assembly by the Economic and Social Council: (1) the adequacy of the first 18 articles of the draft, setting down specific rights, (2) the desirability of including special articles on the application of the Covenant to federal states and to dependent territories, (3) the desirability of including articles on economic, social, and cultural rights, and (4) the adequacy of the articles relating to implementation. Committee IV on October 26 adopted a Cuban-Mexican resolution, opposed by the United

States, designed to obtain information on the implementation of previous Trusteeship Council and General Assembly resolutions concerning trust territories. The same day, Committee VI concluded its general debate on part I of the report of the International Law Commission. In Committee V, the first reading of the 1951 budget estimates continues.

Security Council

In the past 6 weeks, the Security Council has held 14 meetings at which it considered certain phases of the Korean situation, the Soviet-proposed agenda item concerning Formosa, a series of complaints involving Egypt, Israel, and Jordan, and the question of the appointment of the United Nations Secretary-General.

The unified command's fourth report on operations in Korea, August 16-31, was presented for the Council's "cognizance" by United States Ambassador Warren R. Austin at its September 18 meeting. This report, recalling the Soviet claim that all materials being used by the North Koreans had been provided prior to Soviet withdrawal from North Korea, stated that North Korean equipment of Soviet origin had been captured bearing the dates of 1949 and 1950, and Ambassador Austin introduced "physical proof" of these findings at the Council meeting. The report also stated that every precaution was being taken to avoid the bombing of Korean civilians by United Nations aircraft, and at a subsequent meeting on September 30, the Council overwhelmingly rejected a Soviet resolution condemning bombings by the United States air forces in Korea.

On September 26, the Council began an involved debate on the "Complaint of Armed Invasion of Taiwan (Formosa)" and, more particularly, on the question of extending an invitation to Chinese Communist representatives to participate in Council discussions of this matter. The debate, which continued through the Council's September 27 and 28 meetings, resulted in the adoption on September 29, by a vote of 7 to 3, (United States, China, Cuba) with 1 abstention, (Egypt), of an Ecuadorian resolution deferring Council consideration of the Formosa item until its first meeting after November 15, and at that time extending an invitation to a representative of the People's Republic of China to attend Council meetings on this subject. The Council later upheld its president's ruling that this vote was procedural when the ruling was challenged by the Chinese representative. In commenting on the Chinese position, Ambassador Ernest A. Gross stated that, although the United States strongly opposed inviting Chinese Communist representatives at this time, his delegation believed it would be most undesirable for the Security Council to accept the proposition that an invitation to an outside party to be heard was subject to the veto.

Examines Palestine Complaints

On October 16, the Council, under the presidency of Ambassador Austin, began examination of six specific complaints relating to the Palestine question—an Egyptian and a Jordanian complaint against Israel and four complaints by Israel against Egypt and Jordan. After hearing representatives of the parties present their views, the Council on October 20 agreed without objection to the suggestion of its president that Maj. Gen. William E. Riley, Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization in Palestine, be invited to its next meeting on this subject to present information on "questions of fact" that had arisen.

After two closed meetings on October 9 and 12 to discuss the appointment of the United Nations Secretary-General, the Security Council informed the General Assembly that it was unable to agree on a recommendation. Three additional closed meetings have since been held on this same subject, October 18, 20-21, and 25, without agreement being reached. Ambassador Austin has stated that the United States believes so strongly that Mr. Lie, whose term expires February 2, 1951, should be continued in office that the United States representative on the Council has made it clear that "he would strongly oppose any other candidate for the office." Pointing out that Mr. Lie had "received nine votes in the Security Council, a majority sufficient to elect him if it had not been for the veto of the Soviet Union," Ambassador Austin said that it was the settled purpose of his delegation "to use all its resources to prevent an attempt to punish and repudiate Mr. Lie" for his stand in the Korean crisis.

United Nations Commission for Indonesia.—In a report, October 11, to the Security Council the United Nations Commission for Indonesia noted that the Indonesian Government had refused the Commission's offer of good offices in settlement of the disturbed situation in the South Moluccas. The report suggested that the Security Council reinforce the Commission's authority by calling upon Indonesia to utilize existing machinery for peaceful solution provided by the Commission's presence in Indonesia.

Economic and Social Council

In compliance with the General Assembly's request of October 7 that it develop plans in consultation with the specialized agencies for Korean relief and rehabilitation, the Economic and Social Council reconvened its eleventh session at Lake Success on October 12. A temporary committee of seven Council members, on which the United States is represented, has been established to make a preliminary estimate of the size of the program required for Korean relief and rehabilitation. This Committee, meeting in closed session, has heard a statement by the representative of Korea

on his country's relief needs and resources and has before it figures presented by the Secretariat and the unified command. On October 25, the Council completed its consideration, on the basis of an Australian draft resolution and various amendments proposed by the United States and other delegations, of the principles to govern United Nations relief and rehabilitation activities in Korea. The Council then turned to examination of a joint resolution in which the separate proposals of the United States and of Australia for the organization of relief and rehabilitation activities in Korea have been merged. This draft resolution proposes the establishment of a United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency under the direction of an agent general and responsible to the General Assembly, which would function in close relationship with the new United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

On October 26, the Council, on the recommendation of its Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, heard a representative of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions present the views of that organization on the question of "assistance for the civil population of Korea." This hearing, which the U.S.S.R. had opposed, caused the Soviet representative to raise again the question of alleged difficulties that the World Federation of Trade Unions representative is having in entering the United States. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations recently held two meetings, pursuant to the Council's resolution of last August, when the representatives of some 11 non-governmental organizations presented their views on the general problem of Korean relief and reconstruction.

Specialized Agencies

The Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), under the presidency of Dr. Edward Warner of the United States, reconvened for the second part of its eleventh session on September 27 at Montreal. In addition to various administrative matters, questions for discussion include the possibility of establishing in the north Pacific a network of ocean-weather stations, similar to those maintained in the north Atlantic under an ICAO agreement, and the need for jointly supported air-navigation services in such regions as

the African-Indian Ocean area, the Middle East, and the European-Mediterranean and South American areas. The Council also will consider requests of members for technical assistance.

The General Council of the International Refugee Organization (IRO), meeting in Geneva, October 9-13, for its sixth session, voted unanimously to extend resettlement services to those refugees who had arrived in areas where IRO is operating between October 15, 1949, and October 1, 1950. In light of this decision, the Council voted to extend the period of IRO operations from March 31-October 1, 1951. This group, which was ineligible to receive such services under a previous Council resolution, constitutes approximately 55,000 additional refugees to be resettled by the IRO. The organization plans to resettle some 200,000 refugees during this fiscal year.

On October 25, the Council of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) convened in Washington for its tenth session. The Council will review plans for the special session of the FAO Conference to be held in Washington, November 3-11, and for the removal of the Organization's headquarters to Rome early next year. The Council also has before it, in addition to various administrative and budgetary questions, the task of reviewing the world food situation, a report on commodity problems, developments, since its last session, on technical assistance, and plans for a study of FAO long-term trends and objectives.

Two international conferences are currently in session. At Geneva the United Nations Intergovernmental Tin Conference convened on October 25 "to discuss measures designed to meet the special difficulties which exist or are expected to arise concerning tin and, if considered desirable, to conclude an international commodity agreement." A draft agreement prepared by the International Tin Study Group will serve as a basis for discussion at this Conference, and although the United States is participating, it has questioned the necessity of such an agreement at this time.

At Torquay, England, the third of a series of conferences, sponsored by the United Nations, to negotiate tariff reductions, has been in session since September 28. The United States, as one of the contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade signed at Geneva in 1947, is taking part in this Conference.

Contents

General Policy	Page	Occupation Matters	Page
Partnership of World Peace. Address by the President	683	Public Notices Affecting U.S. Property in Germany	692
U.S. Attachés Detained by Rumanian Militia	695	Freedom Ceremony at Berlin	694
Letters of Credence: Burma	702	East German Elections Denounced as Fraud: Statement by Secretary Acheson	695
United Nations		Technical Assistance	
and Specialized Agencies		Point 4 Project in Iran Announced	703
Seven Nations Propose Means To Unite and Keep the Peace. By John Foster Dulles	687	National Security	
United Nations Documents: A Selected Bibliography	691	Military Assistance Agreement Concluded With Thailand. Statement by Ambassador Edwin F. Stanton	701
Advancement Toward Self-Government of Trust Territories. By John Sherman Cooper	705	U.S. Speeds Shipment of Arms Aid to France and Indochina	704
The United States in the United Nations	712	International Organizations and Conferences	
Economic Affairs		U.S.-Indonesia Sign Economic Cooperation Agreement	702
Economic Outlook in India and Pakistan. By George C. McGhee	698	Lewis H. Van Dusen Named to NAC Staff	702
Treaty Information		U.S. Delegations:	
U.S. and Brazil Enter Cultural Agreement: Ceremony of Signing and Summary of Agreement	696	Intergovernmental Tin Conference	707
Statement by Secretary Acheson	696	Petroleum Committee (ILO)	708
Statement by Mauricio Nabuco	697	International Wheat Council	708
Text of Convention	697	Geography, History, and Cartography	709
Military Assistance Agreement Concluded With Thailand. Statement by Ambassador Edwin F. Stanton	701	The Congress	
Tax Treaty Negotiations With Finland	704	Legislation	686
U.S. To Invoke "Escape Clause" Under GATT	710	The Foreign Service	
		U.S. Attachés Detained by Rumanian Militia	695
		Resignations of Ambassadors Douglas and Thurston	695
		Publications	
		Recent Releases	711
		Correction	711